NUNC COGNOSCO EX PARTE

THOMAS J. BATA LIBRARY
TRENT UNIVERSITY

331.62 1025

WHITE CAPITAL & COLOURED LABOUR

By the Same Author

FABIAN ESSAYS IN SOCIALISM. 1889.
(*Contribution.*)

THE ANATOMY OF AFRICAN MISERY.
1927.

THE EMPIRE BUILDER. (*A Romance.*)
1927.

WHITE CAPITAL & COLOURED LABOUR

LORD OLIVIER

NEW EDITION, REWRITTEN AND REVISED

Published by Leonard & Virginia Woolf at
The Hogarth Press, 52 Tavistock Square, London
1929

CENTRAL LIBRARY

HD 6305 . S76 1979

NATIONAL CENTRAL LIBRARY
321.62
1025

Printed in Great Britain by
NEILL & CO., LTD., EDINBURGH.

DEDICATED TO

AFRICAN PEOPLES

FROM MEMBERS OF WHOSE RACES THE AUTHOR
HAS LEARNT MUCH OF THE NATURE OF MAN

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2019 with funding from
Kahle/Austin Foundation

https://archive.org/details/whitecapitalcolo0000oliv

PREFACE

The chapters which made up a small book published under this title in 1906 were written as periodical articles and reprinted as a volume of "The Socialist Library," edited by Mr Ramsay MacDonald. From then till now there have intermittently reached me, from readers who might well have been thought likely to hold somewhat diverse views on its argument, expressions encouraging me to believe that the original essays had succeeded in stating clearly and in a manner enlisting assent some pertinent truths very often unrecognised or ignored; and since the book, long ago, went out of print, I have frequently been asked to republish it.

But during the twenty-five years which have passed since it was conceived many developments have occurred in some of the most important fields of contact between White Capital and Coloured Labour. By those terms I mean, respectively, European (generally in the scope of the book, British) employers controlling land and industrial capital, and peoples chiefly of African race, whether descendants and successors of slaves in our older colonies, or uncivilised natives brought under white sovereignty in the Partition of Africa—viewed as workers employed or sought to be employed at wages by white men in agriculture, mining, public and engineering works, or such other industries as accompany the establishment of European civilisation in their countries. Moreover, contributions are continually being made by biology, anthropology, and social and economic studies to the critique of racial relations.

The book, therefore, could not be considered suitable for republication as a contemporary commentary in its original form. Its presentation of material facts would, under present conditions, have been incomplete and ill-

balanced. For the most part, nevertheless, its original content, so far as its statements and arguments went, still commends itself to me, and apparently to sympathetically disposed readers, as substantially true and suggestive in the circumstances of to-day; and in rewriting it I have been satisfied to leave much of the most emphatic parts of its matter, in effect, as they were originally written or to recast them with only formal and verbal revisions, except where it has been imperative to take account of economic and social developments which have altered the balance between its premises, or where facts not adverted to in it have suggested themselves as relevant. The original text appeared to have been expressive enough to engage that unexpected degree of assent and approval of which I have spoken; and some of the considerations which it emphasised twenty-five years ago, although they have gained some ground in public and practical recognition during the interval, have still to be apprehended by many of my fellow-countrymen by whom it may be useful that they should be realised. I shall therefore endeavour, when suitable, to restate them, within the limits of moderation, still more clearly. Much relevant historical material has accrued which may help in supporting them.

The principal developments which furnish new material and in connection with which I have added new argument may be summarised under the following heads:—

1. Further attention to problems of agricultural industry in mixed communities in the West Indies, both independently of direct employment by white capital and in association, direct or indirect, with it.

2. Similar further development in West Africa, most conspicuous in the native cultivation of cocoa.

3. Development of mining and other industrial enterprise in Africa, and especially within the South African Union.

4. Further, in South Africa, two very notable and important phenomena, reacting upon and reinforcing each other, namely:—

(*a*) The effective revival during a recent period in South Africa, owing largely to the political amalgamation of the former Boer republics with the Cape Colony and Natal,

of dogmatic discrimination between the respective human rights of white and black or coloured peoples, which reinforces and aggravates the normal economic propensity of the white land-owning and employing class to take advantage of its political, economic, and military supremacy over a landless wage-working class.

(*b*) Both in sympathetic association and in political combination with this propensity, the determination of the white employees represented by the South African Political Labour Party to take like advantage of their share of the exclusive political power of Europeans, to keep down the native workers, who have no political franchise, in the position of unskilled and low-paid labourers, and to debar them by legislation, as well as by the exclusiveness [1] of their own Trade Unions, from entering skilled occupations or improving their position by combination. This policy has been specifically asserted and reinforced by the South African Industrial Colour-Bar Law of 1926 and by concurrent Native Affairs Regulation Laws.

5. Most importantly, on the whole, of all developments, the evolution of the experiments in the exploitation of new territory through capitalist enterprise on a large financial basis which were initiated in our own Empire by the grant of Charters of government to joint stock companies, most familiarly to the British South Africa Company for Mashonaland, Matabeleland, and Northern Rhodesia.

6. The annexation and white colonisation of East and East Central African territories and the expedients of European employers for securing supplies of black labour in those territories, for example in Kenya.

7. The declaration in the Covenant of the League of Nations and the boldly professed adoption by British Governments of the doctrine of the "trusteeship" of white races for the civilisation of coloured and backward peoples in Africa and other parts of the world, particularly in the territories which formed, before the Great War, the colonial empire of Germany. The most important statement committing the British Government to this principle, in African territories not administered under mandate of the

[1] Nominally some Trade Unions in South Africa are open to natives, but in practice they are not admitted.

League of Nations, was made by the Duke of Devonshire in the Kenya White Paper of 1923 (Cmd. 1922), declaring that in all our African territories the interest of the natives must be regarded by the Government as "paramount," and that, "if and when the interests of African natives and the interests of the immigrant races should conflict, the former should prevail."

8. Generally and comprehensively, and in a direction adverse to that of the pronouncement just quoted, the fact that within the lifetime of my own generation, and very impressively within the experience of those who, like myself, have been continuously associated with the affairs of British Crown Colonies and Protectorates, the whole colour of the influentially prevalent and actively effective ideas about Imperial relations with our dependencies of mixed population was changed. The keynote of that change was sounded by Mr Joseph Chamberlain in the historical phrase that our Imperial possessions must be treated as "undeveloped Estates." According to the traditions in which the generation to which I belong was brought up, and which, when I joined the Colonial Office in 1882, were established and vitally active in its policy, British Colonies were organic human communities having populations of various admixtures of race, but all of equal rights as British subjects. Emigrants to those colonies went there to make their living. To the older temperate countries, which had for the most part evolved independent political life of their own, they went as to places where they could establish themselves as units of the community with better opportunities than at home for turning their own productive abilities to account. Mostly they went either as working farmers or wage-workers. In the communities of mixed race, the West Indies, West Africa, Mauritius, Fiji, and the rest, they could claim no more special privilege than they could if they merely changed their sphere of employment at home. No one spoke of them as Missionaries of Empire, or thought of the Colonies as milch-cattle for England, "estates" to be "developed" or exploited for the benefit of the Mother country, or of their lands and "backward" peoples as intended by Providence to be appropriated and impressed into service for the profit of Britain. The policy of the

Colonial Office in its administration of mixed communities was held very strictly to the principles of Victorian Liberalism. The experiences and lessons of the revolt against the slave-trade and slavery had not passed out of mind. Nor indeed have they yet entirely done so: there is still active conflict between the humanists and the exploiters; and the recently invented doctrine of "trusteeship" for natives, alluded to in the foregoing paragraph (7), is itself the expression of a reaction, in the same sphere of economic ideas, against the doctrine of "undeveloped estates." It is in the same line of thought and vocabulary: the line of Mr Galsworthy's *Man of Property*; but it is better than nothing.

The earlier book now rewritten dealt with the difficulties in the relations between white and black, economic and racial, in the aspect in which they were then most generally thought of. Since that date it has happened that the great development of the deliberate policy of extracting wealth from Africa has actually made the issue between Europeans and Africans much more visibly and distinctly one of "White Capital" *versus* "Coloured Labour" than a generation ago, to, probably, most people who thought about it, it actually seemed to be. This cannot but be recognised by anyone who looks back on the last forty years' development of Imperialism: whether his own sympathies incline to the doctrine of "Britain's undeveloped estates" or to that of "trusteeship" for natives.

The only part of the book in which I have seen any reason to modify the form of its original argument consisted of a few passages on the subject of Race Fusion, discussing the manner in which the combination of inherited qualities by interbreeding appears to proceed. The effect of their argument stands good, in my opinion, to-day, and it is implicit in the whole of this book; but when I wrote it the enlightening and corrective critique of "genetics" (a word which has itself come into popular currency since that time), which has grown out of the observations of Mendel, was in its infancy, and even in its then stage of development was unfamiliar to me. The analysis of the phenomena now generally recognised as displayed in the inheritance or elimination of characteristics in the breeding of plants and

animals has very much clarified the critique of the facts resulting from the intercurrence of different racial strains, as to which, when I wrote, I shared some cruder hypotheses then commonly prevalent, based on summarised observations of general truths.

Unfortunately, the observations of the specialists who contributed to discussion upon this topic at the Oxford Meeting of the British Association in 1926 made it evident that profounder study, whilst it has pruned some hypotheses of our ignorance, has not as yet done much towards increasing assured knowledge about the relations between what were in those discussions distinguished as "physical heredities" and "psychical heredities" or as to the laws of the latter. So that the corrections and adjustments which it might be now possible to make in the biological generalisations suggested in my original book do not appear either to discredit or to corroborate such generalisations in regard to the psychical aspects as were associated with the physical. Direct observation of behaviour and of recognisable active motives and incentives still furnishes the only substantial material available for psychological generalisation.

From this point of view it has always appeared to the writer to be idle to argue, as many people still do, from biological generalisations or theories as to race, that negro racials cannot do or feel certain things, when negroes actually do them and show that they feel them. I do not in this book attempt to deal at all completely with questions of the final significance of distinctions of race, but opinions with regard to them so greatly affect industrial relations that they cannot but receive some discussion.

The title of the book (which defines its principal theme) is summary in its classification—*White Capital and Coloured Labour*; and in the course of it I shall frequently make use of such general terms as "Capitalist Industrialism," "the Capitalist System of Production," "Capitalist Imperialism," "Commercial Imperialism," "Exploitation of Labour," "Proletariat," and similar expressions familiar in economic discussions. This technical vocabulary may, I have little doubt, seem pedantic and tiresome jargon to some of my readers; but I think it even the more desirable on that account, in this Preface, to emphasise and justify its

employment, because, in the contemporary controversial discourses of politicians, writers, and journalists who do not sympathise with the Socialist and Labour movement, whose adherents use such terms a good deal, a habit is growing up of disparaging them as obsolete formulas. It is necessary for clear thinking and for the prudent guidance of policy that it should be recognised that such terms have substantial and definable meanings and contents, corresponding to present realities in the relations between men and men.

For example, it seems often to be assumed by political speakers and writers for popular, as distinct from scholarly, audiences, that there are people in numbers sufficient and of a quality of intelligence so rudimentary as to make it worth while to approach them with such arguments as that Socialists must be misguided, because they attack Capitalism, whereas, they protest, every man who owns anything is more or less of a Capitalist, and is therefore himself attacked by and should oppose the Socialist movement; or that Capital is useful and indispensable for the production of wealth, and that Socialists would therefore destroy wealth. They even go so far as to propound the befogging suggestion that the working-man's power to work is his Capital, or that the depositors in the Post Office Savings Bank are Capitalists, and their interests threatened by Socialism. Recent writings of Mr H. G. Wells have lent some encouragement to this form of obscurantism by suggesting that there is no such thing as the Capitalist system, and that the notion that there is or ever was such a system was an imaginative invention of Marx. Mr Wells has intelligible and very respectable reasons for adopting this argumentative posture. He desires, I think, to impress some doctrines akin to those insisted on long ago by Auguste Comte in his Positive Polity, but, I cannot but fear, in the light of subsequent economic history not likely to be quickly effectual, not only as to the supreme responsibility of organised financial power in the modern world, but as to the generalised attitude from which the reform of industry and society and the functions of high finance must be approached, if European civilisation is to be saved from collapse, and he hopes to convert all intelligent and efficient citizens to them. Criticised from that point

of view, the economic categories to which he demurs may well be considered unreal or indefinite, just as they appear unreal or inconclusive from the point of view of almost any religion and certainly from that of Catholic Christianity, or would appear if society were composed of convinced and practising Christians or Positivists. But this shifting of the point of view does not render valueless, for men whose lives are governed by existing economic relations, the very convenient economic classifications the names of some of which I have quoted. Throughout this book I use the term Capital in the sense in which all Socialists use it, namely, land and other material requisites for or aids to the production of wealth, owned and used, or withheld from use, by their possessors and controllers for the purpose of producing profits by means of the employment of wage-paid workers, or of obtaining the proceeds of other men's industry by virtue of monopolies of such land and capital (credit included) owned and controlled by themselves.

It happens that the propriety of some of the terms I have mentioned and the reality of their meaning are peculiarly distinct in the sphere of those relations of white men and coloured with which I deal in this book; because, whereas, a great part of the British Empire was colonised not capitalistically but by the emigration of men and women who went to work for themselves, other parts of our earlier colonies were colonised capitalistically; actually, in fact, by joint stock companies or grantees of large blocks of land, assigned to them by the Crown for estates with the intention of exploiting them through the use of slave labour, whilst practically the whole of our recent colonisation in Africa, to speak only of that continent, has been essentially capitalist colonisation in precisely the same sense, financed by European syndicates and investors, and the active directing work of it done by men who go out as landowners or farmers and employers and organisers of labour, the labour which they expect to employ being not now specifically chattel slave labour, but the labour of native black men. Irritating, therefore, as I am aware that it is, to our patriotic Imperialists, that we should speak of the Imperial expansion of the last forty or fifty years as Capitalist Imperialism, an expression which some tenderness, peradventure, of con-

science in regard to its exploits and methods provokes them to resent as a reproach, they will find themselves forced to admit, if they examine the history of the progress of modern African colonisation, that the expression is closely descriptive, and may be taken, in this volume, to be used in a strictly critical sense, and without prejudice. If they are convinced that Capitalism is a salutary dispensation, there is no reason why they should resent as aggressive historical statements about it. Modern African colonisation affords, in fact, an exceptionally pure demonstration of the interaction of White Capital and Coloured Labour. It is for my readers to judge of its morale.

CONTENTS

CHAP.		PAGE
	Preface	7
I.	Introductory	19
II.	Race	31
III.	The Industrial Factor in Race Prejudice	44
IV.	The Three Periods of Colonial Policy	49
V.	The Transplanted African (I)	59
VI.	The Transplanted African (II)	68
VII.	The Transplanted African (III)	76
VIII.	American Corroborations	83
IX.	The Uncolonised African	90
X.	Indentured Immigration	99
XI.	The Idleness of the African	103
XII.	Latter-Day South African History	117
XIII.	Coloured Labour in South Africa (I)	127
XIV.	Coloured Labour in South Africa (II)	156
XV.	Native Labour in Portuguese Africa	175
XVI.	The Missionary Plea	186
XVII.	Educational Problems	194
XVIII.	Influences of the White on the Black	207
XIX.	Kenya	211
XX.	The Kenya Forced Labour Controversy	225
XXI.	Development and Civilisation	254
XXII.	Pass Laws and Registration	263
XXIII.	The Impossibility of Repressionism	268

CHAP. PAGE

XXIV. The New Departure of 1919 274

XXV. The Doctrine of Trusteeship 283

XXVI. The Pilgrimage of a Negro Peasantry . . . 292

XXVII. The European Workers' Charter for Coloured Labour 320

XXVIII. Long Views and Short on White and Black . 327

XXIX. A Fourth Period of Colonial Policy . . . 338

Note on Chapter II, p. 39 342

Summary of Contents 343

WHITE CAPITAL & COLOURED LABOUR

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY

THE general aim of this book is to discuss the effects of association between white people, commonly spoken of as representing European or "Western" civilisation, but viewed especially in their economic activities as traders, planters, industrial organisers, employers and masters, and people of those races (in the scope of the book chiefly African) that are popularly described as "coloured," when the latter are brought, by contact with white men, into the position of employees, wage-workers and labourers, labour tenants or contract-bondsmen, used or sought to be used as assistants in the white men's economic activity. What is the White man going to make of the Black, or the Black of the White in industry? The question is one of very rapidly growing importance.

Much has been written bearing upon this topic under the stimulus of the increasing interests of white men in tropical countries, since the principal European Governments, now nearly fifty years ago, were scrambling for the Partition of Africa. One view of its significance was idealised for popular currency by Mr Rudyard Kipling in the phrase "The White Man's Burden," which British Imperial patriotism was invited to shoulder. Mr Benjamin Kidd wrote his well-known books on *The Control of the Tropics* and *The Government of Tropical Dependencies*. A doctrine was thus popularised, not essentially at all inhumane or ignoble, but liable to be accepted in somewhat crude interpretations by the colonising individuals whose

activities and enterprise created in practice the situation that was developing, and certainly very influential in the minds of some of the statesmen and administrators who had to handle that situation—a doctrine which might be briefly summarised thus: Tropical countries are not suited for settled habitation by whites. Europeans cannot work in their climate or rear their children there. The native can prosper and labour under good government, but is incapable of developing his own country's resources. He is barbarian, benighted, and unprogressive. One of the principal reasons for this arrested development is that his livelihood has been made so easy for him by natural conditions that he has not been obliged to work, at any rate not to work steadily and in a proper and workmanlike manner. The European therefore must, in the interests of human progress, make arrangements to enable and to induce the black man to work productively under his direction and training. To him the economic profit, which the black cannot either create or wisely use; to the black man peace and protection, relief from disease and famine, moral and social improvement and elevation and the blessings of European culture in general. To effect these uplifting developments is "The White Man's Burden"; in this spirit must we control the tropics; along these lines alone can the problem of racial relations in our new possessions be solved.

It is pertinent to observe that this philosophy, which the idealisms of Mr Kipling and Mr Kidd undoubtedly did a great deal to popularise, was primarily conceived and elaborated with special reference to tropical countries in which white men were not expected to make their own permanent racial homes. It was manifestly prepared for by admiration of the character of the administrative, organising, directing, and executive work done by the British in India and Egypt, and by confidence about what similar work could effect if applied to the problems of the much wider fields for similar work which were opening out in Africa. These were the examples appealed to by the poets and prophets who invested with popular glamour the imperialism of their generation. Sympathetically conceived, the philosophy invited a programme of administrative and engineering efficiency rather than one of industrial and profiteering

exploitation. And, speaking very broadly and generally, it may be claimed that the ideas of high-minded men who accepted it with disinterested goodwill have been applied, with advantage to Africans, over extensive areas added in Africa to the British Empire. But at the time when its political vogue was being established few of those who accepted it in this country were thinking of the conditions of what is called "white man's country" in Africa, or were intimate with the problems characteristic of mixed societies already established in areas so described. Fifty years ago the limits of established "white man's country" in colonised Africa lay within the boundaries of the South African Republic and the Orange Free State. The British settlement of Rhodesia had not been imagined. The highlands of Kenya and Tanganyika had not been prospected as the future homes of European communities. And when the genuine colonisation of these areas began to attract attention they were not advertised as countries in which the white man could take up his burden, but as profitable and delightful places of residence for young Englishmen with a little capital. And they are still being so advertised—in our daily Press—as offering all the advantages of the pleasantest life on earth, that of an English country landowner or gentleman farmer in a good sporting country. Whatever may prove to be the future fate of equatorial Africa, the comparatively recent white settlement in such countries has contributed to the problem of the relations between white capital and coloured labour a great deal of matter for thought which was not in evidence when first the new imperialism was being preached and when the first edition of this book was composed. The subject of "white men's countries," predominantly inhabited by black men, in Africa, now invites much more detailed consideration than at that time it appeared to do.

I have referred to the philosophy of "The White Man's Burden" theory without criticising its premisses. But these demand some scrutiny, for the problems arising contain some elements of which that theory takes commonly too little account. "Half devil and half child" was the lyrical description applied by Mr Kipling to the human material to be dealt with. We need not entirely scout it

as inappropriate. But doubts, or at least a disposition to cautious consideration, begin to make themselves felt as soon as we approach the inquiry what kind of a saint is expected to be made of the devil and what kind of a man of the child? The savage, we say, is not "civilised." Is he capable of being taught to adapt himself to the characteristic industrial forms of our own civilisation? Are we satisfied that it is desirable that he should do so? Are the operations and methods in which white capital does actually engage coloured labour attractively representative of the essentials of European civilisation? Are the agents employed in them typically well qualified to promote its appreciation? These are not ironical questions. Many responsible people whose intelligence and the humanity of whose disposition command respect apparently take it for granted that the answers must be "Yes!" What, indeed, do we understand by "civilisation" and what or which are the characteristics, whether spiritual or utilitarian, of our own civilisation which we should soberly think it desirable to impart to African native races? Stress is laid, particularly in some areas of intermixture, on "racial" characteristics. What is race? Have distinctions of race any bearing on the relations of capital and labour? Granted racial distinctions, how deep do racial characteristics go? And what common characteristics of human nature are there more fundamental and more important to be regarded because they are in the long-run more powerful than race and racial peculiarities? Is it not, to detached reflection, sometimes apparent that some parts of what, according to our customary habits of thinking, is devilish or childish in savage peoples, are the embodiment or manifestation of ingredients in human nature that may act as a wholesome solvent of some limitations of our own racial and conventional civilisation? It needed a Zulu's unbiassed intelligence to enable Bishop Colenso to recognise certain obvious critical difficulties in the Pentateuch. That record is typical. It is useful to bear it in mind when the doings or sayings of savages startle or shock one. Like those of children and lunatics, they frequently compel one to review what it is that one really does feel and think oneself.

The African peoples, which include a great variety and intermixture of distinguishable racial strains and of which

the two principal groupings are commonly distinguished as the negro and the Bantu, make up the most important "uncivilised" mass of humanity. I shall not deal in this survey with the brown or the dark white peoples of the Mediterranean area or the "Semitic" strains that have filtered into Africa from the north and north-east. Both these, especially the brown "Hamitics," have impinged on and interbred with the Negro, Hottentot, and Bushman stocks. In North Central and West Africa the resulting populations make up the so-called Negro mass: southward and through East Africa, the tribes, also racially mixed, described as "Bantu," because their languages are akin or of common origin. Both these divisions are "negroid," incorporating the curly-woolled, ebony-skinned, broad-nosed, long-headed typical black man whose hypothetical primitive common stock is distinguished as one of the three or four great racial divisions of human kind.

The negro more than any of these African peoples has been brought into intimate and influential contact with Europeans by the process of slavery. With negroes white capital has experimented protractedly in the West Indies and in both continents of America, under varying social and economic conditions. The Asiatic peoples, negroid, brown or white, racially in some cases much nearer akin to Europeans than any Africans are, have attained far earlier maturity in their civilisations, in which they long forestalled Europe, and offer far less tractable material than the African for economic and social development and specialisation. Their territories, moreover, are fully occupied. European permeation and exploitation of China are inconceivable in the sense in which we are witnessing such permeation and exploitation of Africa, in which there may still be room for the evolution of completely new types of productive communities. The populations of India are now unlikely to become in any important degree more amenable than they are to the operations of European capital. Capitalist Industrialism is indeed growing up there, and Indians, having long ago developed outstanding skill and taste in handicrafts, are perhaps more constitutionally adapted to capitalist industrial methods of wealth production than are Africans; but the problems of such developments in India

seem likely to arise increasingly between Indians and Indians. The North American Indian races in general are a dwindling and ineffectual survival very recalcitrant to capitalist civilisation; the Pacific negroid races do not display the expansive fertility and the colonising vigour of the African negroids in their principal strains.

Some preliminary discussion of the difficult topic of race seems to be necessary, in order to clear the ground as far as possible of some prepossessions and almost axiomatic assumptions entertained by a good many people about unalterable limitations of racial faculty, which are constantly reflected in doctrines as to the attitude necessary or appropriate in the industrial relations between white and black. It is, doubtless, indisputable that the social conventions and assumptions of one race may fail to find sympathetic response in another, whose own special racial temperament and prejudices may offer a stubborn resistance to appeals which to the former seem to express the perfection of human reason, quite independently of difference of language. The grammar of interracial intercourse is still imperfect. At present the satisfactory carrying on of such intercourse is largely a temperamental matter, a practical art; but its methods not really a mystery. The faculty of dealing with alien or uncivilised races, untrained in the assumptions of our civilisation, like that of dealing with children likewise untrained, may be more or less a personal gift, but essentially it is merely an application of common human intelligence, perspicacity, sympathy, and good temper.

It is important to attempt to do justice to the more markedly distinguishable psychological and temperamental characteristics of African racials and to realise the conditions of life under which apparent peculiarities have been evolved. It is sometimes hastily said that "the native mind" of the African is "inscrutable"; but much of its working is unaccountable only to the commentator who considers it exclusively from the standpoint of his own pursuits and interests.

In this connection I have myself found it very enlightening and instructive, and an exceedingly useful corrective of prepossessions and prejudices still mischievously and disastrously prevalent, to examine the phenomena manifested

among populations of African origin which have been transplanted from their native environments and kept under the continuous influence of the white man—first in slavery, and, subsequently, either as members of a labouring proletariat or as a free peasantry. The materials for such a survey lie principally in the British West Indies and in the United States of America, and I propose to examine their aspect in these lands with some fulness. Returning thence to Africa I shall review the conditions prevailing in territories of the British connection there both in colonised and colonisable regions and in those in which residential white colonisation is not attempted, and the problem taken in hand has been simply that of the opening and control of tropical countries for the profit of Europeans, both as consumers of the exports they can be made to yield and as exporters of the goods they can be induced to consume.

Under all these diverse conditions one complaint on the part of the white man is found to be common—that the black man is lazy. And at the back of the black man's mind there persists (not, as a rule, expressed—sometimes most deeply dissembled) a profound and unquestioned conviction that the white man is there for the purpose of getting the better—of "taking advantage," to use a constant phrase—of the black. Both impressions have justification, and neither is completely and finally just.

It should be recognised and borne in mind that in this country the public opinion that supports European, or perhaps I should only say British, Imperialism in Africa is, on the whole, a humane and liberally disposed sentiment, and that there is a good deal of justification for satisfaction with the results of our interventions there, fully allowing for all that must be confessed of injustice and detriment to large numbers of the natives. White intervention has generally started by taking in hand what native government in African communities had never succeeded in doing with any permanence; maintaining peace and establishing a basis for social development. There have been extremely able and very powerful native rulers, some recklessly bloody, like Chaka, some pacifically statesmanlike, as was Moshesh, but their dynasties have generally been shortlived. It would hardly, however, be reasonable for any European nation

seriously to claim for itself moral credit for any such good results, where they can be shown, as though the desire to effect them had been the incentive of its colonisations. For although our public opinion is liberal and philanthropic, and, if informed and aroused, as it was a hundred years ago in regard to the slave-trade and slavery, may be relied upon to condemn and restrain oppression, and even to make sacrifices for what it feels to be right, its cognizance of the operations of African exploitation or processes of development lags generally far in the rear of the practical activities of their operative promoters, and receives very incomplete information about them through the Press or the libraries. "There is no money," editors and publishers tell us, "in Niggers." With rare and special exceptions, so peculiar in their circumstances as to serve, when examined, merely as proofs of the general rule (as in the cases of the Protectorates established in Basutoland and Bechuanaland), no nation has ever colonised, annexed, or established a sphere of influence from motives of disinterested philanthropy towards a native people. Bechuanaland itself was first "protected" merely in order to block Boer expansion. That part of it which was required for British Imperial purposes (namely, to keep the road to the North open for Mr Rhodes' Cape to Cairo railway) was annexed to the Cape Colony, and has since been incorporated in the Union of South Africa, by no means in the interests or to the satisfaction of the native inhabitants, but much the reverse, as the history of the Langberg "Rebellion" testifies. Only what lay on the west side of this "corridor" remained a "protected," not incorporated, native territory. In order to maintain an unsophisticated and unprejudiced habit of judgment in regard to Imperial expansion, it is necessary always to bear in mind the historical truth that the motive of almost all such expansions has always been the interest, immediate or anticipated, of European traders, treasure seekers, investors, or colonists, or to punish or restrain cattle-stealing or attacks upon white missionaries or explorers. It should also be remembered that where such restraint or punishment alone has been the object, or even where allegiance has been tendered by native chiefs for the purpose of getting protection, the extension of sovereignty was repeatedly in times past refused, notwith-

standing all the benefits that European rule might presumably have brought to the natives, so long as no white man's economic interest backed the demand. Historically, the Partition of Africa was not engaged in in order to take up the White Man's Burden or for any philanthropic or humanitarian motive, but in order to ensure that the productive resources and the consuming markets of the distributed territorities should be kept open to the several national Powers that appropriated them, or, in some cases, to guarantee from encroachment the boundaries of previous appropriations. The agreeable belief that Europe in the Partition of Africa "took up the White Man's Burden" has produced a good deal of soporific illusion which has kept the British nation complacently unaware of much that has been done in its name which, if realised, would have profoundly disturbed it.

I do not wish to lay stress on what has been objectionable in the results, but it is essential that these topics should be approached with an intelligence purged of cant. It is ignorant and perverse to denounce the Partition of Africa and the intercourse of the white with the black as unmixed evils for Africans; it is unjust comprehensively to talk about European administrators and officials as merely parasites on the countries they govern, whether India or others; but we must set out with a clear recognition of the fact that when the European colonises or annexes tropical countries the force that actually sets him in motion is a desire for his own commercial or industrial profit or possibly to secure some position necessary for the defence of Imperial communications or other national advantage, and not a desire to benefit coloured people. When he really wants to go to Africa for the sake of the natives he becomes a missionary. There is no disparagement of the colonising European in recognising and bearing in mind this fundamental fact. He has, in my opinion, an incontestable human right to go and inoffensively to seek his fortune in any part of the world he may choose without molestation.

The European only begins to become obnoxious when he seeks to entrap, constrain, or coerce uncivilised natives into subservience to his personal interest under the pretext of doing them good. In hardly any country except England

and the United States, however, is it possible, or assumed to be necessary, that there should be any public profession of disinterested philanthropy in connection with Imperial expansion. Such a pretence was deliberately diffused in the United States to justify the Americo-Spanish War of 1898, the annexation of Porto Rico and the Philippine Islands, and the commercial incorporation of Cuba into the sphere of American exploitation. (I myself was at Washington during the period of that enthusiasm, and remember its glowing atmosphere.) Nicaragua and Central America generally are now experiencing the attentions of a kindred benevolence. Philanthropic motive is almost always advertised to the public of England whenever we have similar exploits on foot. Our own electorate is, in fact, still so liberal minded and so humane in its disposition towards native African peoples and, in parts, still so traditionally suspicious of the designs of exploiting capitalism, where natives of Africa are concerned, that in order to commend to it policies of Imperial expansion it has generally been deemed necessary to appeal to its benevolent interests. The establishment of our power over Uganda and the building of the Uganda railway, for which there were substantial Imperial and commercial motives, were urgently (and sincerely enough) appealed for as a means of killing the slave trade. The invasion of Rhodesia and the appropriation of all its land by the British South Africa Chartered Company, which were prompted by precisely similar imperialist and commercial motives, were engineered and accomplished under pretext of suppressing the atrocities of the Matabele.[1]

If, when we have come into contact with backward races through such pursuit of our interests, we so order our dealings that benefits, on the whole, accrue to them (which is far from being entirely or always the case), if it may actually be to the native's interest (as is often the case, and he finds it so) that the white man should employ him at wages, that

[1] Both Mr Rhodes, originally, and later Sir H. B. Loch, High Commissioner of South Africa, were urgent that the British Government should simply annex and keep the Matabele in order; but the Government of the day preferred the policy of Commercial Imperialism and persisted in getting the Chartered Company launched.

is no reason at all for claiming moral credit for ourselves for the colonisation. The native (bear this always well in mind) is not deceived in this matter. He may recognise and appreciate the immediate advantage of being relieved from molestation by martial tribes or slave raiders, and, if he is part of a conquered and overrun population, he may appreciate deliverance from exacting overlords, but his memory of the relief will be short, and for the most part he remains, or quickly becomes, in his relations with his new white governors, devoid of any lively feeling of obligation conferred, or reason for gratitude on these accounts towards their local representatives. He sees that what they do they do for their own purposes and not for his. Hence, often, arises that fundamental suspiciousness in his mind which offends us as uncharitable and ungracious. Hence, sometimes, what we denounce as his treacheries and his rebellions. Moreover, no more than the farming or trading or mining colonists do the men who go to these colonies to take part in the Government go there, generally speaking, from philanthropy. They go, as a rule, primarily to earn salaries, and, though they may display the spirit of a devoted public service, it must always be remembered that to the native they and their dependents are merely a set of rulers, making a living out of his country and out of the taxes they make him pay, because they cannot make it at home, and interfering with his affairs as a pretext for doing so, even if the taxation levied is not, as it often is, still more obviously imposed for the purpose of making him work for white employers. We must austerely disenchant the facts and dispel the glamour which our conviction as to our own moral standards, our consciousness of our own altruistic purposes, and our desire to think the best of ourselves, may hang about them for us, before we can hope to form any accurate judgment of the aspect in which those facts appear to the African.

In short, in any survey of questions of colonisation and conquest the moral or philosophical justification follows after, and is quite secondary in importance to the facts of the will and interest. These lead,—the white man's purpose of making his living or his desire of increased wealth determine expansion. No colony can be made by a bene-

volent theory of Imperialism; it can only be made by acts of Imperial policy, and these are in practice chiefly dictated by efficient practical interest and by the operations of people who want to colonise and are capable of maintaining themselves as colonists. And it is between these parties—between Capitalist-Imperialism and its agents and the coloured populations of colonised countries—that the questions this book has to deal with arise. The problems and details of annexationist policy, of conquest and invasion—the topics of native wars and rebellions—are antecedent to those of industrial relations in the established colony, and, although rebellions have repeatedly arisen from crude methods of attempting economic exploitation, I do not desire to devote space to their criticism. It may be impossible to ignore them entirely, because, although in some communities the industrial relations between Capital and Labour have grown up independently of such conflicts, in others they have not. For example, such factors have nothing whatever to do with the relations between white capital and coloured labour in the United States, the West Indies, our West African colonies and Nigeria, in Uganda, or theoretically in Kenya, but they have something to do with them still in the Cape Colony, more in Natal, a great deal in the Northern Provinces of the Union of South Africa, something in Rhodesia and Nyasaland, something for a quite different set of reasons in Tanganyika, and something, by a kind of induction or infection of Boer tradition, in Kenya. We are, in fact, witnessing as I write a remarkable manifestation of reactive influence by the attitude towards natives characteristic of the Northern Provinces of the South African Union upon the different traditions of the Cape Colony, subsidiarily of Natal, and more remotely, but not with less importance, in British East Africa.

CHAPTER II

RACE

WHAT constitutes race? It is still possible, apparently, for many people to think of "races" as though they had originated generally in special creations, of the individuals that compose them as specially contoured characters entering life on earth in suitably appointed or chosen environment, and of some races as intended by their Creator to serve and some to dominate. But we are, I think, in Europe (though not yet in the United States of America), entitled to deal with the moulding causes of race from the point of view of evolutionary biology, to believe, that is, that the physical and temperamental distinctions of races have been shaped and stereotyped by the conditions of their environment during the course of their respective natural histories. I take it that the distinctions (I do not say the human identities) exhibited by races can be to a very great extent validly explained on Darwinian principles of selection, and that whatever may be deemed essentially human (or essentially divine, if you will) in man, it is certainly not his distinctions in the category of race. There are endowments common to all races, in greater or less degree, about which great controversy has indecisively raged, as to how they could have been produced by natural selection; the musical sense, for example (in regard to which Darwin's own hypothetical biological explanation was extremely absurd); and still more remarkably and puzzlingly, we find in distinct races, remote in time and place, exhibitions of very specialised and elaborate human faculty and achievement in Art, Science, Philosophy, and Religion, for the emergence of which it appears quite impossible to assign any plausible explanation in parallel biological causes arising out of identity in physical environment.

But special differentiating characteristics of races may confidently be said to be, in great measure at any rate, reactions of the physical environment of a stock realising its will-to-live continuously and progressively under special controlling, but not overpowering, conditions, little altered through long periods of time. We may even go so far as to say that the special race characteristics which such protracted process will evolve, although they may be, for the race concerned, a necessary condition of its best-adapted existence in its environment, are probably, at any rate are often, limitations, excrescences, or shortcomings of humanity. It is possible to hold this judgment, both as to the savage and the civilised, without implying the dogmatic assertion of any essential or final human type.

Moreover, as a further preliminary caution, one salient, ubiquitous reality must also be borne in mind: the infinite, inexhaustible distinctness of personality between individuals, so much a fundamental fact of life that one almost would say that the assimilating race characteristics are merely incrustations concealing this sparkling variety. It is common enough, indeed, for hasty observers, whose faculties of perception and sympathy are baffled by their racial limitations, to tell us that the people of some foreign tribe or nation are all precisely alike, both in face and character: intelligent and sympathetic insight, however, will always disclose, under every human complexion and civilisation, the same independent definition of each individual that every one imputes unhesitatingly to the persons of his own intimate circle. Not even "two peas" are really alike: and no closely observant gardener would use the vulgar adage. Yet, again, notwithstanding all this variety amongst individuals—far wider than the variety among races—we meet, so far as race does not preclude us from seeing it, in every human being an ultimate, unmistakable likeness to every other, transcending Family, Race, and Nation alike, yet in no wise overbearing, or transcending, or neutralising his own individuality, but rather establishing and completing it, and at the same time knitting it up with our own.

What circumstances produce a distinct race, the race that the Greek poets spoke of as "autochthonous"—sprung

from the soil? Apparently, first and chiefly the Earth—long settlement in the same country and climate. These influences having done their work, a racial type will obstinately persist in even a race become nomadic and cosmopolitan, as the Jews and the Gipsies. The strain remains recognisable even though it may be modified by a new domicile and by intermarriage. The Jews of different countries are not difficult to discriminate at sight to an accustomed observer. The ancient race-theory—the myth of earth-parentage—appears to be a true account of the greater part of the matter. Whatever may be the cause or creative force of humanity, the distinguishing and moulding force of race appears as local environment. It is necessary, perhaps, to emphasise this, because, to a mongrel town-dwelling population it tends to present itself as merely a poetical figure of speech. Towns do not produce physical races, they obliterate them. Towns, doubtless, produce social types, as London the cockney, but that is a different thing. Such types vary rapidly. The town-dweller who has not himself undergone the moulding and nourishing power of Earth in natural surroundings is likely and prone to suppose that the city may do what the country does, which is not the case. The evolution of the Boer people, one of well-marked physical and mental characteristics, notwithstanding that it is of mixed immigrant origin, Dutch, French, and in some degree British, is an instance of the development of something very like race, within modern record, by the conditions of the South African veldt, a witness of the race-making power of the Earth still at work in her uncocknified regions.

When a race has established and maintained itself for generations in a consistent environment—a primitive race not reaching as yet a very high degree of civilisation—and has staved off the disadvantageous effects of excess of population by means of birth control, infanticide, organised emigration, or moderate chronic war with its neighbours, it will have fitted all its bodily adaptation and the processes of its daily life so intimately and so fully into the mould of its natural surroundings that it will not be conscious of itself as other than a part of nature. Such a race, in the vigour of its maturity, is a full cup; its form is saturated

to the skin with the energy that has forced it into the natural mould of its life; it is sensitive at the surface, reacting immediately according to its own native impulse, not critical of its motives and instincts, not hesitant between feeling and action, thought and word, not sceptical where it believes. It is very fully aware of the things of its own world; it is not aware of, and does not imagine, things outside of it. The invisible, for that race, abuts entirely upon, and is concerned only with, its own visible world. The habitual religiosity of the pagan resulting from this condition is unimaginable, unintelligible, to the faculties of the European normal invader, who at best is conscious in himself of a duality, a "war in his members," and for whom, in general, religion is in great part an auxiliary and detachable equipment for certain purposes, a matter of clergy and Sundays, perhaps of "salvation," but certainly not of "business." The only forces the primitive race knows are those that mould, impel, and attack it: its spiritual world is the community of its own ancestors: its gods and devils are all concerned with itself; and thus it comes about that each natural race, when it comes to personify the invisible, no matter whether its god-ery be singular or plural, its devils one or legion, believes and feels and knows itself to be a "chosen people." I say "knows itself," because its knowledge, like the rest of its life, will have followed the mould of its biological evolution, and because it will have developed only such associations of theory and understanding as its environment has permitted. And accordingly when, confronted with other tribal god-eries, it enters upon theological criticism, it lays down unhesitatingly (if it has any sufficient self-respect) that all those gods are but idols, but that it is its Lord that made the heavens.

Moreover, it will, from precisely similar causes, develop the belief that it is itself the crown of Creation, free Man, and itself only, and that all other nations are outer barbarians, Gentiles, savages, and by nature designed to be slaves, which it, the chosen people, will never, never be. This has constantly been the expressed doctrine of patriotic philosophers in more or less primitive peoples, when they have passed into a self-conscious critical stage. Even Aristotle could not transcend this universal illusion. In

this country, even among our confusedly blended people (easily distinguishable to the eye of a field anthropologist into at least a dozen long-domiciled, distinct racial types) it had come, not many years ago, to be so unquestioningly and universally held, that Mr Kipling's "Recessional," which expressed some post-Jubilee qualms in regard to it, was hailed by our popular critics as an achievement of superhuman inspiration, almost blasphemous in the audacity of its humility.

Because of their evolution in different environments and their differences in physical adaptation and social heritage, all races are likely to differ one from another in their capacities, their knowledge, and their powers; and each race, so far as it works by the light of its own formulated conscious knowledge and critical and logical habits, is constitutionally unprepared for understanding or even imagining the existence of much that enters into the life of each of all other races and that may be either the most sacred or the most commonplace thing in that life. Further, it is noticeable that more than one of the races of which we habitually speak as inferior, and which appear to be effete or decaying, are far in advance of the average Anglo-Saxon who is deemed to be our own type and standard, not only in some of the most desirable and attractive human qualities, but in artistic, poetical, and other of the higher spiritual forms of genius or faculty. When, therefore, individuals of different races are confronted, each of them is largely deficient in mental equipment for even apprehending the existence, far more so for understanding the significance of much that is vividly alive and permanently important in the consciousness of the alien. The one cannot recognise that the other is a full cup; he shapes for himself a ridiculous patchwork caricature of a few conspicuous characteristics as a hypothesis of the foreign creature's nature, and fills out the figure with the attributes of the children, the imbeciles, and the criminals of his own nationality. I could not refer to a better corrective of this style of illusion in relation to savage races than the late Miss Mary Kingsley's books on West Africa, in which, with a fine, direct sympathy, the insight of the straightforward woman of genius, she analysed and appreciated the psy-

chology of the native tribes of the "Coast"; quite seriously taking them as rational human beings to be weighed in the same scales as the white races.

The criticism, therefore, which one race may pass on another will almost always be impertinent and provincial. Complete apprehension of the racial point of view, complete recognition of what it really is that the alien means by his formulas, is hardly to be attained. In many cases a meaning common to both races is disguised by different modes of expression; in many the two need considerable education before they can even be capable of meaning quite the same thing. A clear understanding is essential between those who are to be fused into one organic community. What avenues have we towards interracial understanding?

We encounter, in the United States, in South Africa, in India, and elsewhere, a conviction on the part of the majority of the racially white inhabitants that the white and the coloured can blend no more than oil and water. Whatever be the explanations of race prejudice, and whatever our judgment of its significance, its existence must be recognised as a fact of very influential importance in regard to mixed societies. On the other hand, it is evident that in countries with a vigorous black population no stable mixed community can grow up so long as colour prejudice, distinction of privileges between white and black, and race antagonism maintain their supremacy. Such relations between white and coloured in a white-governed State are only compatible with the institution of slavery or with modified analogous forms of domination. Whether the white man likes it or not, the fact must be faced that, under the capitalist system of industry, which deals with the coloured man as an independent wage-earner, and in a society in which he has the stimulus of the white man's ideals of education, the coloured man must advance, and he visibly does advance, to a level of understanding and self-reliance in which he will not accept the negrophobist theory of exclusion. Especially will this be the case if the elements of the Christian religion are communicated to the coloured people and the New Testament placed in their hands, even if they are not otherwise educated; as the feudalism of Europe discovered when the same revolutionary

matter got into the heads and hands of its peasantries. The condition of the society in which this process is taking place grows increasingly unstable, unless race prejudice and race discrimination are modified.

In the history of the world assimilation has in fact come about to a vast extent by interbreeding and mixture of races. And though the idea of this method may be scouted as out of the range of practical consideration or influence in connection with modern colour problems, and though I should admit that it may tend to decrease in importance as compared with direct mental conjunctions, yet I consider that the habit of opinion and sentiment at present in the ascendant unduly undervalues its real importance, and I propose to mention some reasons for judging that where it takes place it is advantageous. We should at least give full credit to its possibilities before passing to consider other methods of fusion.

The question of the relations between white and coloured races is obscured by a mass of prejudice, ignorance, and lack of perception, proportional to the isolating differences in their evolved constitutions. These barriers are not different in kind or in strength from those which once separated neighbouring European tribes. What has happened as between these we can trace and recognise, and this recognition will help us to approach the contemporary problem.

What happens when two persons of different race intermarry? Each race, we have argued, has produced its own specialised body, adapted to a limited exercise of human capacities. In neither case, one may say in no possible case, is the average race-body (including the brain and nervous system) anything approaching to a competent vehicle of all the qualities and powers that we imply by humanity. Of course, we have had very splendid and comprehensive human types among those races of whose activities and productions records remain, and I think there can be no doubt that there have been others equally capable, of which there is only fragmentary and inferential record; but none that we can judge of come near to satisfying us as being completely and immediately capable of all the human apprehensions and activities known to us. I do not wish to overweight this idea of the limitation or special-

isation of racial faculty, which not only can be enlarged, more or less, by educational influences, but is staggeringly transcended by men of what we call "genius." The truly great men of all races are impressively near akin. Each race, too, on the premises thus suggested, is likely to exhibit habitually a good deal of human faculty that is absent in others. So far, then, as there survives in a mixed race the racial body of each of its parents, so far it is a superior human being, or rather, I would say, potentially a more competent vehicle of humanity. I say this with reservation, because there are certain sets-off to the recognised advantages of hybridisation which must be taken into account and to which I shall return later. To people who suffer from the complex of a horror of "colour," which is a specialised and localised form of race prejudice, and not more universal, stronger, or more "natural" than are similar prejudices between persons distinguished by other accidents, I would here observe that I am thinking not only of mulattoes or crosses between white and "coloured" races, but equally of the interbreedings that have produced the most progressive of "white" nations, including our own, and of blends of coloured races.

The human body, we gather (at this stage of microscope manufacture), originates from a selective combination out of two sets of cells. Each set, theoretically (so I read), can build up a whole new body by itself. (This is called Parthenogenesis.) In practice it habitually combines for the work with another set, supplied by a parent of opposite sex. Unless the qualities or potentialities resident in both sets of cells are precisely identical, or unless the differing qualities are eliminated in the shuffle, which according to the experiments is by no means what happens, though some may emerge dominant and some lie recessively latent until evoked by a fresh combination, it would appear that the power that employs itself in the making of life (which is evidently omniscient but apparently limited in effective command of materials) obtains by hybridisation at any rate a more widely ranging instrument to use for its purposes. How far it will be a superior, and how far, as it often is in some respects, a less reliable instrument, depends on conditions of which nobody knows anything safe to assert dogmatically.

But in the course of a number of generations of interbreeding of hybrids of two original strains there comes to be established something like a real new race, combining in a stable amalgam a particular selection of the qualities of both. This stabilisation of new varieties has long been a practical art in plant and animal breeding. The observations and generalisations founded on the studies of Mendel have added a good deal to the practical science of these operations.

The development of the physical constitution follows the guidance provided in the inheritance of the body-building chromosomes, and it cannot be doubted that the capacity of exhibiting and exercising mental qualities follows like conditions.

But the most arresting fact that appears to be emerging from recent studies of evolutionary anatomy is that the brains of the higher species appear to have developed in advance and, it is tempting to say, in anticipation of the necessary, common, or even possible exercise by the mass of the species of the faculties thus provided for.[1]

The distinction between the different sets of cells often persists for many generations, notwithstanding the modifying influence of environment, which presumably tends to overcome the immigrant type, or both types if the home of the hybrid race is different from that of either parent. And at first, in many cases, the hybrid will really be obviously and conspicuously two kinds of man. When cells of Race A and cells of Race B have done their parts side by side they will be conscious of and internally criticise one another, each claiming to do the job in his own way. This very often spoils the hybrid's digestion. Quite often, of course, the joint work is more efficient. And sometimes, when the A cell has done work unfamiliar to the B cell or the B to the A, the one may have been unable to maintain any balance with the other, and will probably be quite unable to control its proceedings when its primitive instincts are strongly aroused.

Indeed it would appear, not only that certain qualities of cells are chronically recessive and others dominant, but that in occasional crises the whole vitality, power, and consciousness may transfer itself to one side of the combination, as occurs in cases of multiple personality under hypnotic

[1] See Note A at the end of this book.

influence. And this transference is by no means always to the side of the race reputed inferior. If the mulatto may "go Fantee," he may also, at times, entirely transcend his more barbarous instincts and consciousness.

Such cases, however, are rare: for the most part there appears to be a mingling of character with a good deal of double consciousness, so that to a fortunately constituted hybrid his ancestors are a perpetual feast; he knows them from inside, and he sees them from outside simultaneously. I do not go so far as to say that a man to be a good critic must be a hybrid, but I think it would be found to be pretty generally true. Foreigners constantly make the mistake of thinking that Englishmen and Scotsmen are hypocrites. Only one who is both an Englishman and an alien—whether British, Irish, Welsh, Cornish, French, Spaniard, German, or Jew on his alien side—can really appreciate and enjoy to the full the rich feast of contemporary English psychology. Its most humorous, because most sympathetic, satirists are Englishmen of mixed race. And the same, of course, may be said of all the literature of satire in any society.

A further characteristic in the hybrid as distinguished from the man of pure race may appropriately be noted. Whereas the pure race in its prime knows one Man only, itself, and one God, its own Will, which has created it in its own image, the hybrid is incapable of this exclusive racial pride, and inevitably becomes aware that there is something, the something that we call the Human, which is greater than the one race or the other, and something in the quality of creative power that is stronger than national God or Will. What were, for each specialised race, final forms of truth, become, when competing in the field of our human consciousness, mutually destructive, and each recognisably insufficient. Yet the hybrid finds himself still very much alive, and not at all extinguished by the loss of conviction as to the paramountcy of either of his confronted racial dogmas.

An experience somewhat similar occurs to a race whose racial God is defeated and deposed by conquest: and where a conquered race has not, as the Jews and several other nomad races have done, transcended the usual domiciliary and settled habits of permanent races, has not spiritual-

ised and mobilised its God and moved conquering among its nominal conquerors, we have seen either a practically atheistic philosophy adopted, of renunciation of the Will, or a second new God set up, as among the mixed broken peoples of the Roman Empire—the God of the human and the conquered, who knows himself something more than his conqueror. Even Imperial Rome, which went further in its deification of its own will than any great people on earth, by making its Commander-in-Chief, its Cæsar, its national God, was captured by the reaction of the culture of the nations whom it overran. The flood of Oriental mysticism drowned the old tribal fetichism of Rome, and thus prepared the way for much of what grew into Christianity.

But it is not only cultured and civilised races that may know themselves in some respects greater than the beef-witted race that conquers them. I pass from the case of hybridised peoples and deal with that of the survivors of an ancient conquered race. If they avoid physical degeneration (as, retaining their old habitat, there is no presumption that they will not) they do remain to a great extent invincible. So long as they remain a race, their God, their Will, their pride of place as the chosen people survives; and they see often that the conqueror is only a heavy-fisted brute, to whom they know themselves to be superior, not, indeed, in all effectual qualities, but in many of those which mankind most values and which are most distinctively human. We need not speak yet of the African, or even of the Hindu. Irishmen, doubtless, recognise that the English have great qualities, and yet it has not been possible for the Irish to accept English rule. All other nations of the world do Irishmen the justice of perceiving that they have an endowment of qualities the absence of which in the typical Englishman has rendered him somewhat imperfectly loved, and when not feared, disliked, as lacking in essential humanities. Now not only the Irish under the English, but every conquered race that remains unmixed, retains in itself this seed of invincibility, this treasure that it has and its conqueror has not, which makes it the superior of its conqueror, so long as he treats it not as human but as alien and inferior. Every race (not hybridised), however much it may respect its conqueror for respectable human

qualities, also despises him for his shortage in others, just as woman, treated likewise by man, has despised him to the full as much as he in his claim to the lordship of creation has disparaged her.

In fact, the lack of mutual understanding that arises from race is strikingly analogous to that which arises from difference of sex, both in its origins and in its manifestations. The origin is bound up with differences of bodily adaptation and function. How common it is for each sex, in moments of irritation, to charge the other with perfidy and lack of straightforwardness. How universal is this same accusation between different races. But the fact is that the truth is really different for different races and for the two sexes. They live to some extent in different worlds. A conquered race that speaks two languages will tell the truth in its own language, and will lie in that of its conquerors—very often from an honest desire to tell what it supposes to be the conqueror's truth, namely, what he desires, which is what, in fact, is real for him through expressing his will. This phenomenon is widely familiar from the Groves of Blarney to the haunts of the Heathen Chinee.

Sir Harry Johnston in his little book, *The Backward Races*, and Dr Norman Leys in *Kenya*, explain very lucidly the principal reasons in their environment why few African peoples have yet succeeded in developing civilisations. Isolation from the great streams of civilisation which have diffused true human culture from the homes of its early development has no doubt been paramount among these causes: but the conflict with parasitic diseases, the vagaries of African rainfall, intertribal warfare, raiding and pillage, and, more than anything else, the incessant slave-taking promoted during three centuries by Christian and Moslem peoples, have been the principal factors of their repressive environment.

The negro is progressing, and that disposes of all the arguments in the world that he is incapable of progress.

> "When I am discouraged and disheartened, I have this to fall back on. If there is a principle of right in the world which finally prevails: and I believe that there is: if there is a merciful but justice-loving God: and I believe that there is: we shall win: for we have

right on our side: while those who oppose us can defend themselves by nothing in the moral law, nor even by anything in the enlightened thought of the age.

"The main difficulty of the race question does not lie so much in the actual condition of the blacks as it does in the mental attitude of the whites: and a mental attitude, especially one not based on truth, can be changed more easily than actual conditions . . . the difficulty of the problem is not so much due to the facts presented as to the hypothesis assumed for its solution.

"When the white race assumes as a hypothesis that it is the main object of creation and that all things else are merely subsidiary to its well-being, sophisms, subterfuge, perversion of conscience, arrogance, injustice, oppression, cruelty, sacrifice of human blood are all required to maintain the position, and its dealings with other races become indeed a problem, a problem which, if based on a hypothesis of common humanity could be solved by the simple rules of justice."—J. W. Johnson in *Autobiography of an ex-Coloured Man.*

"We are ranged on the side of civilisation. Our interests are intertwined with civilised interests. We would not like to go back naked to the kraals and live a barbarous life. We have renounced that life once and for all. If to-day there were a war between barbarism and civilisation we would be on the side of civilisation. The Europeans regard us as a solid block of undifferentiated barbarism and the Europeans as a solid block of innate capacity to govern; whereas the division is not on these lines. The division is between civilisation and ignorance, which may be found in both blocks. There are many Europeans not capable of governing, just as there may be a few black men who are so far removed from their native conditions that they would not make a mess of civilised interests. The fact is, we are growing and developing under civilisation, and we shall be more and more a power on the side of civilisation."—Dr J. J. T. Jabavu, Professor of Bantu Languages in the South African Native University, Fort Hare.

CHAPTER III

THE INDUSTRIAL FACTOR IN RACE PREJUDICE

It is an unhappy but undeniable fact of experience, and it is the basis of democratic conviction and method in politics and industry, that if circumstances give one average man uncontrolled command over the services of another for his own personal purposes, he will in most cases abuse it to the latter's disadvantage. The presumption that a white man will do this if he is given command of black men to work for him is not disposed of by protesting that our countrymen in the colonies are as humane as ourselves in this country. For the most part, indeed, it is positively not the fact that the men who find occupation in the colonies as employers or overseers of native labour are as considerate in their disposition, or as circumspect in their methods of discipline, as the average of British employers in this country: it would be illusory to pretend that they are so; and they certainly do not as a class claim any such qualification, rather shunning the imputation of stay-at-home squeamishness, or, as Mr Rhodes phrased it, "unctuous rectitude." And in the population of a new exploiting settlement such diamonds of the rougher type predominate. Even in a democratic white community—for example, the United States—the attitude of organised white capital towards organised white labour, determined only by economic motives, is frankly ruthless. Nothing is gained by pretending that a labour driver is more considerate when he is dealing with black men: on the contrary, the danger of injustice is greater where there is racial distinction. This, at best, interposes a barrier to understanding of the employee's feeling, and baffles the operation of sympathy: but, where this disadvantage is aggravated by a positive doctrine of racial incompatibility and inferiority, race

prejudice reinforces the tendency to take advantage of the subordinate class in exploitation. The equitable claims that are recognised in the fellow white man are not recognised or are expressly denied to exist in the black. That this doctrine is prevalent, if not absolutely predominant, in the industrial communities that are springing up on a basis of coloured labour, no well-informed observer will for a moment deny.

It is preached unhesitatingly as an axiom of public policy in America and in South Africa that the safety of the State depends upon the maintenance of this doctrine. The distinction in sensibility, in physical needs, in industrial standard between African native races and the white was spoken of by such an authority as Lord Milner as a providential dispensation. I do not suggest that Lord Milner was one of those who regard such distinctions as permanent: he took active steps to provide higher education for Africans; but the authoritative promulgation of such a doctrine reacts upon the temper and attitude of the employer in industry and upon his conceptions of suitable methods for dealing with coloured workmen. That the doctrine is itself rather a product of the industrial relation than a cause of its deficiency in humanity and intelligence is evident from a consideration of the enormous degree to which it has gained ground during the recent extension of capitalist industrial enterprise in territories with coloured proletariats.

The reactions in the United States of the Great War in creating an increased demand in the Middle States for coloured factory labour to take the place of white workers enlisted have considerably, but only temporarily, modified the increase of colour prejudice which was manifesting itself before the War in the Southern States. This increase was due to the development of capitalist manufacturing industry in the South. Industrial antagonism was being stimulated by the competition between white and black labour. White labour was calling in racial prejudice to its aid, as it had been called in in politics; and the white men's Unions were determined to exclude that labour from the factories where they worked. The interlude of the War, which rendered it necessary for employers to fill up their labour vacancies by employing negroes even at the white

man's standard of wages, abated this exclusiveness for a time, and negroes or negro Unions were admitted to the white man's industrial organisations on a footing of equal conditions. But when self-interest impels one race of men to do injustice to another they will find a moral or religious excuse for it. I have already referred to how this affects colour prejudice in America. In South Africa the coincidence is more ostentatious. The phenomena of the Congo Free State, where the native was denied any kind of human right, were purely and directly the expression of exploiting greed.

The closest and most intimate contacts between white men and Africans in Africa have been that of missionaries, who settled among them, devoting themselves to their education. They took with them, and under the practical and personal intercourse have seen no ground for abandoning, the conviction of fundamental humanity of the races, expressed in the religious formula of sonship of a common Father. But when it becomes possible for white men to get into industrial relations with the same native the white man's social theory suffers a change, the secular creed asserts itself, and the spiritual doctrine, in the faith of which chattel slavery was abolished, becomes a laughing-stock. The sentiment that the black man is only fit for slavery is heard quite frequently now; it has become common within our own memory. It is notable that in a country like Nigeria, where there has as yet been little invasion of capital seeking labour for direct employment (notwithstanding the late Lord Leverhulme's benevolent projects), we are still priding ourselves on following the old British theory in practice and eschewing slavery. We still justify our claims to be there on our practical propaganda of freedom. But where that imported demand for productive labour, of which I have spoken above, is becoming the paramount interest in the community, the tendency of local political theory is in the contrary direction.

The "negropholist," to use that question-begging term which in such countries habitually carries so much odium and disparagement, is one whose judgment is not yet warped by the influence of the economic demands of the capitalist industrial system. He takes men as he finds

them upon their general qualities, and has no more prejudice either against them or in their favour than he has under the influence of the snobbishness created by our property system at home with regard to the qualities of the "working man." His most common type has been the Evangelical missionary, but he is common enough in those of our own classes which are not influenced by any distorting interest towards putting material pressure upon the native, or keeping him, as the phrase is, in his place.

The "negrophilist" missionary does not consider that the black man has nothing to learn from the white; he considers that he has an immense deal to learn, and that much of his nature is still exceedingly brutish in departments of character in which civilisation has in greater measure, though very far from completely, humanised and refined the white. But he cannot accept the superficial deductions which race prejudice makes from these differences. All over the world, where white men mix with coloured, very many will be found filled with acute race prejudice. It is rampant among English people in India. But in the same collocations many people will also be found who discern and feel that the race distinctions are superficial, and, so far as being absolute and insuperable, are really, compared with the dominant facts, unimportant. These men have enjoyed personal friendships with persons of the alien race, and they know that such friendship is of precisely the same quality as is their friendship for men and women of their own race or for men and women of France, Germany, or any other nation that may from time to time have been patriotically regarded as "alien" and as the natural foe of their country. But this appreciation of equality is attained in a region of human relations quite distinct from the sphere of economic self-interest; and the man who comes in contact with other races under the stimulus of economic motive or purpose is not favourably placed to discover it. Quite the reverse. In the simplest form of such confrontation he may, if he enter the aliens' country, have to fight for his life before he can even think of peaceably producing his own living, much more of getting the alien in helping to do it. In South Africa the Boer migrations into unoccupied territories where they had every

right to settle had actually in some instances to compete with a simultaneous counter-immigration of military Bantu tribes. The resulting conflicts and mutual cattle-stealing activities permanently affected the whole social theory and interracial balance of the Northern territories of the South African Union. We must recognise that the contacts of human races seeking subsistence have always for the most part begun with war, and that if Britons are hostile to any European nation to-day it is chiefly through economic jealousy. And even of those who assert the inferiority of the alien many admit an essential human equality; only they allege the necessity of making the alien behave himself by processes that involve the practical denial of it.

CHAPTER IV

THE THREE PERIODS OF COLONIAL POLICY

My survey of the relations between White Capital and Coloured Labour will be in danger of seeming confused, because both doctrine and practice in regard to those relations are in the world of to-day a mixed inheritance from historically successive stratifications of different state policies and popular feelings about them, the effects and traditions of which survive and overlap. General statements will be open to criticism and inconclusive, because although, broadly speaking, European peoples and especially British enterprise have for the most part habitually confronted African peoples in the relation of employer and employed, this is not comprehensively and exclusively true, and has been truer at some periods than at others. The temper of mind vaguely called humanitarianism, which coincides largely with the democratic creed and the fundamental principles of Christianity, has always been adverse, and at some periods vehemently and effectually adverse to the temper which lies at the root of colour prejudice and the disposition to think of the African as a predestined labourer and to sanction his being treated accordingly.

There have been three principal types of European economic relations with countries inhabited by coloured races, of which the most important in the scope of this book is Africa.

First: that of trading intercourse, with the local settlements associated with it. The evolution of this type of trading and settlement, and of the extension of Imperial dominion which has accompanied it, has been most remarkable in India, with which, for reasons I have explained, I do not deal in these pages. In Africa I leave out of consideration those parts of the continent which lie in the

Mediterranean area, from Morocco to Abyssinia. The trading settlements in the rest of Africa became important chiefly for the purpose of trade in slaves—that is to say, for the express purpose of a labour supply to the operations of capital. White Capital and Coloured Labour, accordingly, here found their first notable direct confrontation.

Secondly: the colonial type of intercourse, which in European empires generally began in the form of plantations employing slaves of African or other coloured races. This (although white convicts were also assigned to planters as servants under sentence of British and European courts) stereotyped the confrontation of white and black as one of capital and labour. This confrontation, which endured for three centuries, has most deeply influenced European habits of mind in relation to Africans. Different races have lived together in Europe and in Great Britain, and members of one race have subdued prior inhabitants of another: servitude in various degrees has been imposed upon the latter, and in the process of history has been almost completely eliminated. No other two races or combined communities of races, however, have been so long and so exclusively confronted in the relation of master and slave, employer and employee. This was not due to any peculiarity of native or black races: it was due to the fact that the white races were the stronger and better armed, and sought no intercourse with the black except for the purpose of enslaving those they could capture or buy, and that these racials so captured were kept, bred, and recruited exclusively as a slave and employed class. It is no wonder that so many children in the former slave-owning nations are still brought up with fantastic ideas about "niggers" and, in England at least, with uneasy habits in talking about "coloured" people as though African descent were an unmentionable taint or affliction. It is true that many of us were brought up with ideas of somewhat similar character about Irishmen, Welshmen, Frenchmen, Jews, and other foreigners whom dominant Anglo-Saxons have considered inferior to themselves; but there has been no such other school of ignorance and vulgarity as between two great races as during the slavery period there was between Europeans and Africans. That history has profoundly affected

our habits of mind with regard to them. It influences them both positively and by accepted tradition. The revolt against and the repudiation of the doctrine that the negro was created for slavery was indeed emphatic and vigorous enough to proscribe the slave-trade and to abolish the status of slavery in those European-ruled colonies in which Europeans had planted it, but the perversion of human attitude which it created still widely persists. So also, happily, does its detestation and condemnation by Christianised Europeans and all the liberal and democratic temper of Europe. Moreover, even during the slavery period the only other important form of confrontation between Europeans and Africans was in the field of missions, and this confrontation has by the vital force and truth of its resolute attitude continuously maintained a protest against the attitude fostered by the economic relation. So that, although in secular matters and public policy the relation of white men to coloured has been peculiarly that of capital and labour, it would be untrue to say generally, of probably even any country where white men and black men mix, that the attitude of the white to the black is exclusively that of superior and inferior. Everything that I say in dealing with economic relations and their reactions is subject to this allowance for the spirit of relations not economic.

Moreover, the second type of contact, that of true colonisation, has developed locally on different lines. In Africa the early settlers at the Cape, which was the starting-point of true white colonisation, had slaves imported to work for them, and not being competed with for land by the Hottentot natives were not faced with any exacting native problem. Nor when these colonists developed into pastoral trekkers was the native labour problem serious for them in the sense in which it is spoken of as serious in South Africa to-day. They were confronted with competitive pastoral hordes of black men coming down from the North as they came up from the South. They had to fight with them as such competing peoples have constantly had to fight one with another in the course of more ancient history. These conflicts, waged with all the rigours of barbarous war on both sides, created a second complex of

temperamental attitude between the white and the black in the regions affected. The character of this temperamental attitude was truly, as Afrikander historians claim, distinct from that proper to the proscribed institution of plantation slavery, but as the Europeans overran their competitors' lands, subdued them, and began to deal with them as a subject class, the two attitudes tended to coalesce and the white man deliberately dealt with the native as with a creature of inferior rights and treated him as a serf and a bondsman, as the invaders of England treated our own natives, an attitude continually condemned by the mediæval Church, which inculcated the freeing of slaves as a test of piety. This position of the South African native and the temper which insists on it survive to this day. But it is pertinent to observe that a pastoral civilisation is much less hard on its bondsmen than is an industrial system or an agricultural planting system. Hence, as that perspicacious South African sociologist, Maurice Evans, pointed out, the Boers were easier masters to Kaffirs than the British South African farmers. A herdsman's or shepherd's life is less exacting than that of a plantation labourer.

Neither the first nor the second types of intercourse either were or were supposed by anybody engaged in them to be actuated by any consideration of the interests and welfare of natives, with whom, after they had ceased to be useful as merchandise, European Powers desired to have as little to do as possible—so much so that in the middle Victorian period the Liberal policy was to abandon our African colonies, and, indeed, any others in which the population was chiefly African; while so far as South African farmers were concerned, they had little use for Kaffirs, and outside of the agricultural districts regarded them as simply a nuisance, whose residence where they could not be removed off the face of the earth had to be tolerated, but involved no special social or political problem.

The third type of contact dates from the gold discoveries and those of other mineral wealth and natural resources, and the ensuing Partition of Africa. It aims at making the continent a sphere of production for wealth to be extracted by the labour of natives under the direction of Europeans,

and the main confrontation between white and black men is again, as distinctly as it was in the slavery period, one of capital and labour. Nevertheless, in other departments of human relations than the economic field, there have also developed largely those more truly human contacts of which missionary enterprise was the earlier type. There is doubtless much more really liberal humane opinion diffused among white people in Africa than there was, even proportionally, in our plantation colonies during the slavery period, or than could be inferred from the aspect and operations of South African economic and native policies. This fact adds to the difficulty of asserting any general proposition about the relations of white capital and coloured labour in any sphere of their operation. The character, or the European idea of the character, of "The Native Problem" varies conspicuously according to the character of the purposes, incentives, and theories with which Europeans have got into contact with Africans. It differs for the merchant, the miner, the planter, the rancher, the missionary, the Imperialist who views these territories as "undeveloped estates," the administrator who views them as human societies, the Nationalist who views them as his own countrymen's property (as Continental and British judges have demonstrated them sometimes to be and sometimes again not to be, in singular coincidence with the purposes for which Europeans approached them), the Internationalist who regards them as held in trust for their native inhabitants, the intelligent Frenchman or Englishman immune from colour prejuduce, or the Afrikander-indoctrinated South African whose outlook is clouded by it. Such distinctive points of view, each framing the "native problem" in a different perspective, are many and incompatible. Their multiplicity and their inconsistencies make the white man, to the native, a problem truly bewildering. One tells him that the will of God is freedom and justice, another that it is his duty to work for the white man and right that he should be deprived of his land and his most obvious elementary liberties in the interests of Christian civilisation.

It is necessary not only to distinguish the operations of those different types of enterprise in which Europeans have come into contact with Africans, but also to recognise that

during the development of those contacts there have successively prevailed three distinct phases of European colonial policy.

First, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, for the development in newly discovered countries of the production of things desired by European communities, the foundations of an exploiting Imperialism were deliberately laid on a basis of financial capitalisation. Joint-stock enterprise was in fact developed more early in this sphere than it was in that of home manufacture and industry. Excluding small emigrations, such as that of the Pilgrim Fathers or Huguenots, refugees from domestic oppression seeking to build for themselves new homes by their own industry, European colonisation of America, the Antilles, West Africa, the Cape, India, and the Malay Archipelago was initiated by the establishment of chartered or licensed companies in England, France, Holland, and Portugal. In the Antilles and in America, exactly as in our generation in Africa, the land was granted out by European Governments in large estates or concessions, and by the concessionaries to lessees, agents, "factors," and planting colonists. Associated companies organised and conducted the slave-trade. West African trading-posts furnished the slave-market. Merchandise was exchanged for slaves with the native tribes, the slaves were marketed to the planters established upon the assigned colonial lands, and their produce shipped back home to the merchants financed by the home investor. This exploitation on behalf of Capital and the Home Country was the essential form of European Imperial enterprise.

Under the influences associated with the French Revolution and in England with those of Free Church liberalism, the peoples of Europe repudiated this economy. They stopped the slave-trade and progressively freed the slaves. During the same epoch the established colonists repudiated the imperialism of the Home Countries. There followed the second period of colonial policy, that of Liberal Colonialism, characterised by greatly increased emigration of European workers fleeing from the oppressions of the industrial revolution at home. Thus were founded the free societies of our present white dominions, whilst during the following half-century Britain especially, being most

active in suppressing the slave-trade and earnestly libertarian in temper, acquired a special repute as the friend of African peoples. It became an axiom that wherever the British flag flew, there liberty, equality, and justice were guaranteed to all races and all colours. For two generations the policy of the British Colonial Office was resolutely and aggressively liberal, establishing these principles even in the Cape Colony in the face of the sullen obstruction of the inheritance of the slave regime. In all British colonies the expropriation and even the alienation of native land was forbidden, forced labour and child-apprenticeship (now reviving in Southern Rhodesia) were tabooed and extinguished, and administrative systems devised to prevent or to mitigate the oppression of freed slaves by their former masters. On this foundation the policy in our older colonies and in their extensions in West Africa remained, as it still does there, consistently liberal: at the Cape and in Natal the new native territories were protected from white exploitation and a soundly inspired, if slackly pursued, native policy was instituted.

The policy of the third period, that in which we survive, is a deliberate reversion to the capitalised exploiting policy of the first. Joint-stock companies were created to exploit the Congo territories and the lands to the north of the Cape Colony (including those of the Transvaal) and East and Central Africa as rapidly as access could be obtained by rivers, railways, and roads into those territories. The character of much of the process is familiarly scandalous. Its excesses in the Congo State were specially virulent; and circumstances conspired to make them widely notorious: but their essential purpose and method were in no respect different than that of similarly inspired operations in all the territories made the subject of the later Imperialism. British policy has the least odious record in these operations: but its record is blotted with scandals. Public opinion in England, still generally dominated by the complacent tradition established during the period of colonial liberalism, or solaced with the assurance that the White Man's Burden was being taken up, remained stolidly passive, and indeed, for the most part, completely unaware of what was proceeding.

Those, however, who, with historical colonial knowledge, were in touch with the facts at the time, realised quite clearly and with concern that about 1890 British colonial policy was breaking away from its traditional principles, founded not only on axioms of Western civilisation, but on the results of a century of experience in our older mixed communities, and selling the national soul to the exigencies of the new enterprise of capitalised exploitation which inspired the Partition of Africa. European enterprise was once more, as in the slavery period, being deliberately launched into a direct confrontation of white with black, the white seeking the black as a labourer and a labourer only. That breach was resisted strenuously both inside the Colonial Office (by such able official statesmen as the late Edward Fairfield) and by governors and public officers of the colonial service: but their resistance was ineffectual. The charter, for example, of the British South Africa Company was framed with the conscientious intention on the part of the British Government of safeguarding native rights. Scottish dukes were placed on the Board as a guarantee of high principle. The safeguarding provisions were from the outset grossly ignored, and the dukes achieved no function more impressive than that of tobacconists' highlanders. For the policy of capitalist exploitation has its own essential requirements of method, identical, fundamentally, with those of the first colonial period. It depends on enabling white men to thrive on the labour of black. All native rights in Rhodesian land were extinguished, and first the Chartered Company, by a usurpation later declared illegal, and then in its place the British Crown, by a judgment of the Privy Council, constituted themselves exclusive absolute owners. Forced labour, stiff taxation, and rents were imposed on the natives: the pressure was not so savage and so unscrupulous as it was elsewhere in Africa, for the British traditions remained of some avail, if not to restrain, at any rate after the Matabele rebellion, tardily and imperfectly to approach reform and justice.

Imperial policy during the whole of this third colonial period has been effectively inspired in its proceedings in its new territories by the idea of "development." That word recurs incessantly in State papers and governors' speeches

as describing the principal aim to which regard must be had by all loyal British subjects, not only in the interests of European adventurers in these new colonial enterprises, but in framing conceptions of the interest of natives, which are presumed to be bound up with "development," in determining "native policy" and deciding what manner of obligations shall be primarily imposed upon natives by European Governments, and what attitude shall be adopted and maintained towards the question of their own indigenous economics. So much is this the case that it was only quite recently that the Government of Kenya announced as a new departure that its policy was to be a "dual policy"—that is to say, that instead of proceeding as up to date with a single-minded policy of "development" in the interest of the white settlers, some attention must also be paid to the "development" of native agricultural and native administrative institutions, as had been much more wholeheartedly the public policy of the western side of British Africa. It is not surprising that the tentatives apparent in this direction are so far much more elementary and amateurish than have been the operations for the encouragement of white settlement and the profits of capitalist production. But the idea that the Government of a British Dominion must pursue a "dual policy" is itself amateurish, and an acknowledgment of historical ignorance. The interests of both white and black in the West Indies and in West Africa have, as I shall more fully point out, been pursued under principles of equality established by experience during the second colonial period. The mere use of the phrase "dual policy" indicates that one of the units of public policy, which happens to have been paramount hitherto, is a policy on behalf of white capital and its requirement of coloured labour. The Duke of Devonshire's pronouncement that the interests of the natives must be regarded as "paramount" is the directly contradictory pendant to this idea and is equally incongruous with the theory of a balanced "dual policy." It has, however, hitherto been so far from the case that native interests are regarded as paramount that if the proposition had not been discounted in Kenya as harmless eye-wash it would have aroused considerable alarm and consternation among

the supporters of the antecedently predominant "single policy."

These, then, are the three periods of Colonial Policy, to which I shall frequently have to refer in this book. The first period, of White Commercial Capitalism exploiting Coloured Labour transported; the second period, of Colonial Liberalism; and the third period, of White Commercial Capitalism exploiting Coloured Labour in Africa.

CHAPTER V

THE TRANSPLANTED AFRICAN

I

THE future of the relations between white capital and coloured labour in any mixed community depends so much on the possibility of progressive assimilation between the employing and employed races, either, as has occurred in some, through the operation of inter-marriage or through the psychical process of establishing sympathetic understanding through education and association that it is pertinent to consider what, be it little or much, has taken place in this direction in those communities in which people of European and African races have been forced into close social contact. This has been most markedly the case in those white men's colonies in the New World into which Africans were transplanted as slaves, and in which inter-racial contact has been closely maintained for a number of generations, unaffected by the disturbing influences of a background of savagery, such as has persisted in African countries. I propose, therefore, to survey the results observable in such mixed communities in the West Indies and in the United States, glancing both at the operation of inter-breeding and the effects and promise of other influences.

The writer was for twenty-five years a member of the establishment of the British Colonial Office, in which he was attached at different periods to the departments concerned with the government of the West Indian, the South African, and the West African colonies: three principal different types of mixed communities. For the greater part of that period he was most closely associated with the administration of the British West Indies, British Guiana, and British Honduras, in all of which colonies the great

majority of the population is descended from African slaves and is still very largely of pure African race, whilst in all of them there has been continuous residence of white colonists, predominantly leading and controlling the business and economy of production, and in some of the most highly civilised of them a continuous survival of long-established white families. Such islands as Jamaica and Barbados are just as truly white men's countries as are the high lands of South-Eastern, Central, and Eastern Africa, which are now being colonised under that description. They are essentially communities belonging to white European civilisation. The writer has resided in or has visited for purposes of economic investigation all of these colonies, except the Bahama group. He spent, between 1897 and 1913, altogether about ten years in the island of Jamaica, and may claim a very special and sympathetic familiarity with that community. In no colony is there better material for a study of the effects of prolonged association of white and black in the relation of employer and employed; and, whilst the different conditions of other colonies have produced somewhat different results, an appreciation of the characteristics of Jamaican social relations may be taken as affording a very good foundation for a judgment as to the possibilities of racial interaction in any such British community. With regard to colonial communities associated with other European Powers, of which I have no direct internal knowledge, I do not propose to attempt to generalise. I can only refer to authorities.[1]

It used to be very common and it is no doubt still possible to hear West Indian eulogists of the good old days when Sugar was king, and fortunes could be made in the West Indian plantations, enlarging on the industrial virtues of the old-time slave as compared with the character of the free negro produced since emancipation. These moralisers belonged, temperamentally and intellectually, to the school of those who still preach elsewhere the benefits of compulsory labour for the improvement of the African in his own country. Whatever might be the weight of their arguments in support of the views they hold and of the

[1] See especially *The Native Problem in Africa*, by R. Leslie Buell (Macmillan, New York). *The Dual Mandate in Africa*, by Lord Lugard (Blackwood).

methods they advocate, we can at any rate accept from them the admission implied that the raw African is not incapable of improvement—that there was made of him even under slavery in the West Indies something humanly superior to the Guinea pagan. They would even bear witness, quite truly, that the old-time negro often displayed a high and effectual example of Christian character, that he was personally loyal and devoted to his proprietors and their families, and that he was capable of becoming an industrious free cultivator and artisan. Bearing in mind these admissions, let us survey the present condition of the transplanted African, and see what vestiges of social virtue are left him, notwithstanding his discharge from the school of slavery. We will then approach his position in industrial relations and consider what this portends.

Throughout the British West Indies the black and mixed-coloured parts of the population enormously outnumber the white. Very much more so than in South Africa, where such preponderance is by many of the whites regarded as a grave danger to "European civilisation." The social and industrial conditions vary considerably. Where sugar-planting and manufacture, which were the traditional slave-industry, still survive as the most important local business, the land is still for the most part held in large estates and the labouring population is chiefly employed at wages. This is especially the case in Barbados, Antigua, and St Kitts. The fact that land was thus monopolised and that the descendants of the slaves have therefore been constrained to work upon the estates for such wages as the estates would give (which are lowest in these places) was the circumstance that enabled the sugar industry to be maintained there, whilst it failed to so great an extent where the negro was not under like compulsion to work. In those islands and in those districts of islands where the sugar estate industry has been thus maintained the condition of the West Indian negro is still the poorest and the most backward. In the more important colonies of Trinidad and Demerara, where there was less land monopoly, the labour supplied for estates used up to a recent period to be chiefly provided by the importation of indentured East Indian coolies, whilst much of the negro population came

to be settled, as most of it is in Grenada, St Lucia, Dominica, and Montserrat, under conditions more nearly approaching to those which are to be found most fully developed in Jamaica—that is to say, as a peasant proprietary, not primarily dependent upon wage employment, but supplying a more or less uncertain amount of labour available for the larger plantations. Barbados is a unique community, the future of which it would be exceedingly difficult to forecast, because there, owing to close land monopoly and great density of population, there is a thoroughly typical confrontation of capitalist and proletarian classes. Jamaica may be taken as indicating the type of what the ordinary West Indian colony seems destined most probably to become. Apart from estates' work, and, on the mainland, timber, the Trinidad oil industry is the only considerable business in this part of the Empire in which capital and labour are confronted.

The population of Jamaica is now estimated at about 920,000. In 1921, the date of the last census, out of a population of 858,118, 620,000 were described as black—that is to say, negroes, originally of West African stocks, with but little, practically no recognisable, admixture of white blood; 157,223 as "coloured"—that is, recognisably of mixed racial origin; 14,476 as "white," meaning either actually white or not admittedly coloured; and 25,969 as Asiatic (Indians and Chinese) or of other races.

The largest economic class is that of peasant owners of quite small holdings, although in certain districts considerable numbers of black people still live and work for wages on estates, and own little or no land. But where they do not own land they almost invariably rent land, and depend largely for their family maintenance upon the produce. The extent to which land is distributed among these peasants and labourers is indicated by the fact that out of a total of 175,363 holdings of property on the Valuation Roll of the island in 1926, 138,268 were of land-holdings below £100, and 115,831 of land below £40 in value. Practically all these small holdings are owned by the black peasantry and dark-coloured people, their size ranging from half an acre to 50 acres or more. The important "coloured" class of mixed African and European descent largely supplies the artisans

and tradesmen of the community. But very many coloured persons are owners of large or good-sized estates and are prosperous and influential planters, many are overseers and book-keepers on estates, many are commercial clerks or engaged in law and medicine and other professions. Many clergy of all the Protestant denominations are black or coloured; so are all the elementary school-masters and school-mistresses and some of the teachers in the second grade schools. The whites, including a considerable Jewish element, predominate in the governing and employing class, and as merchants or planters in conjunction with the lighter coloured people direct and lead the industrial life of the island.

There is no "colour bar" in Jamaica, no legal or customary discrimination preventing any Jamaican of African or mixed race from occupying any position for which he or she is qualified by intelligence and education in any vocation, including the public service. All places of public resort, public vehicles, and places of amusement are freely open to all without distinction of race or colour. Many coloured and some black men are magistrates of Petty Sessions, coloured men hold or have held office as Custos—that is to say, as chief magistrate of a parish,—the parish in Jamaica being equivalent to a Rural District in England. Coloured and black men are chairmen of the Parochial Boards, which answer to our Rural District Councils, and discharge the same functions in regard to poor relief, local roads, and public health. Black and coloured men are members, both elected and nominated, of the Island Legislative Council. Coloured men hold or have held Stipendiary Magistracies under the Government. Some occupy the Judicial Bench, and they are distributed in all departments of the Civil Service. These positions they fill with credit, although, naturally, the educational and social advantages which the sons of white families have in the past more fully enjoyed tend to give the latter preferences on the ground of merit which the coloured and black classes are only slowly overtaking, as secondary, university, and professional education become more accessible to them. According to their professional standing, black and coloured associate with white citizens on precisely the same footing. In

practice, pure-bred negroes do not as yet generally show the business capacity and ambition of the men of mixed race, and on this account there are few, if any, pure negroes in positions of the highest consideration, authority, or responsibility. Time and education promote a continuous process of change in this balance. The black man, and in a less degree the coloured, are still handicapped by their past history, and in the selection of employees there is no doubt on this account still a preferential presumption of better qualifications in the classes that have had the greater advantages; but of simple race prejudice there is very little, and what there is is manifested on the whole more strongly in the relations between whites and negroes and the intermediate classes of mixed race than as between the white and the black.

It must not, however, be understood that there is absolutely no colour prejudice in Jamaica, or in any other West Indian colony—that is to say, that there is in the minds of domiciled white people nothing answering or akin to the hostility and contempt towards black or coloured people which is boasted by many white folk in the Southern States of America and is even more prevalent now in South Africa; or that there is not, conversely, a latent jealousy of and hostility towards the "buckra" in the mind of the black and coloured. Such prejudices, however, do not appear on the surface, and so much as there is is unquestionably diminishing. It is weaker probably in Jamaica than in any other West Indian community. Such a book as the late Mr Grant Allen's novel *In All Shades*, depicting his impressions of the operation of colour prejudice in Jamaican white society, about sixty years ago, reads to-day as a grotesque extravagance, and might appear to have been imagined by a sensational novelist who had stayed a short time in the island and had read into his or her conception of its society the virulent colour prejudice still extant to-day in the other countries I have referred to. But the book was no doubt fairly true at the time of Grant Allen's residence in Jamaica; and that it is so manifestly untrue to-day is an interesting and important evidence of the prevailing healthier tendency.

Existing prejudice is strongest (on both sides) in the women and on the woman's side of life. The practical

contacts between men in their daily work are more constant and are of a character to explode superstitions where there is no obvious justification for them and when they interfere with the efficient conduct of business. And although in Jamaica and in other West Indian colonies there may be, in general social and professional relations, no barrier against interracial intercourse, there is certainly disinclination on the part of white Creoles to intermarriage with coloured families, and this aversion will probably continue to operate at any rate for a long time to come, to check, in practice, any such complete obliteration of race distinctions as has been foreboded by negrophobists in the United States and South Africa as bound to be the result of the admission of social equality.

It is true that in the West Indies you will occasionally find Creoles of mixed race and good positions married to ladies of pure European blood. But, as a rule, such marriages have not been made in the colony, but in England, where there is less prejudice or sensibility on such matters. Again, you will find men of pure European extraction and good position with Creole wives of mixed race, though perhaps not without special information to be identified as such, nor desirous to be so identified. Moreover, in the lower social ranks of employees in stores, so far as these are recruited in Europe, such mixed marriages may frequently be met with.

On the whole, however, it does not appear that admission to social and vocational equality, when resulting from identity of qualifications and interests, does, in fact, conduce necessarily or prevalently to the promotion of intermarriage; at any rate of frequent and habitual, unhesitating intermarriage.

Whatever it may be possible to argue in justification of a prejudice against interbreeding, it is unquestionable that the coloured people of blended race as they at present exist form a valuable and quite indispensable part of any West Indian community, and that a colony of black, coloured, and white people has far more organic efficiency and far more promise in it than a colony of white and black alone. A community of white and black alone is in far greater danger of remaining, as is conspicuously

to be observed in South Africa, a community of employers and serfs, concessionnaires and tributaries, with, at best, a bureaucracy to keep the peace between them. The graded element of mixed race in Jamaica and in other Western Indian colonies contributes very valuably and very wholesomely to making an organic whole of the community and preserves it from this distinct cleavage.

A significant light is thrown on the psychology of colour prejudice in mixed communities by the fact that in the West Indies, in the whites, it is generally stronger against the coloured than against the black. This is because the coloured intermediate class form such a bridge as I have described and encroach upon or threaten to undermine the economic and social ascendancy of the white, traditionally the dominant aristocracy of these communities. This jealousy, indignation, or irritation is much more pungent than the alleged natural instinct of racial aversion. If colour prejudice were the result of such natural instinct it would be stronger against pure types of the alien race. But in the West Indies this notoriously is not so. In South Africa, on the other hand, there is less marked hostility to and prejudice against what are called the coloured people than against the black. Owing to the peculiar conventions which dominated till quite recently South African economic relations the coloured people there have not competed or threatened to compete with the dominant white class. Nor until comparatively recently did the native. But with the introduction of capitalist industry demanding and using wage-workers according to their qualifications for its own purposes, the native African, rather than the Cape coloured man, has been brought into active competition with the new wage-earning class of white men. Colour antagonism in South Africa has thus become most active on the part of the whites against the pure blacks, and at the moment at which I write there is actually a movement on foot to enlarge the political privileges of the coloured people and to diminish both the political and the industrial rights of the black. Simultaneously, however, there has been adopted within a quite recent period what is called a White Labour policy in the interests of the increasing class of poor whites, and on their behalf coloured men are now being dislodged

from the employment hitherto given them under the Government and to some extent in private industrial employment; that is to say, a new kind of prejudice is in process of growing up against coloured people which did not till recently operate, and which cannot fail to have its reaction in creating an antagonism between the white and the coloured not hitherto seriously felt, in addition to the long-established prejudice and growing discrimination against the black.

The future of blended communities such as those with which I am dealing is one of the world problems with regard to the outcome of which anticipations may greatly differ. Their present comparative promise among human societies may not be high. But the white man has, in fact, created them and continues to do so, and whatever undesirable characteristics—moral, physical, or social—may be accentuated by interbreeding, it is certain that, from the point of view of social vitality and efficiency, it is not the mixed coloured class, if any, that is decadent in physique, intelligence, or energy in Jamaica. I speak of Jamaica because I know that island well. Where, as there, we have created and are developing a community of diverse races there is not, in the light of British West Indian experience, any demonstration that interbreeding is, apart from the reactions of prejudice, necessarily an evil. It would consequently appear reasonable that where we have such a community we had better make up our minds not only not to despise the offspring of the illegitimate interbreeding that invariably takes place and will continue to take place in such conditions, but to make our account for a certain amount of legitimate and honourable interbreeding, and to look upon it as not necessarily or presumably a misfortune, but as more probably an advantage. We need not be much afraid that those persons the racial purity of whose offspring it is essential for the world to maintain are likely to plunge into a cataract of mixed matrimony. Such a development is not at all probable.

CHAPTER VI

THE TRANSPLANTED AFRICAN

II

It is evident from the present character of the social relations between white, coloured, and black in Jamaica that it is possible for a very much healthier balance of feeling and interest to be arrived at in a racially mixed community than has been attained in the Southern States of the American Union or in South Africa. In visits to the United States and in talks with Americans I have constantly been impressed with what, in the light of West Indian experience, have appeared to me exaggerated and ill-founded apprehensions as to the dangers and difficulties likely to arise in a community predominantly composed of coloured people where colour prejudice is relaxed—apprehensions which practically do not affect or disturb Jamaica at all. Visitors to that island—British as well as Americans—discussing with me our conditions there prevailing—used to ask me how we encountered this or that problem or difficulty connected with the intermixture of races, which was or seemed to threaten to be a trouble in the United States. On such occasions I have found myself, as a British West Indian, unable entirely to account for an attitude of mind which impressed me as superstitious, if not hysterical, and as indicating misapprehensions of premises somewhat ominous for the United States in the future, but which appeared from the tone of the Southern newspapers at that time to be increasingly general in the community in regard to the race question.

My latest direct experience in this connection was gathered, I should explain, about twenty years ago; and since that time there have doubtless been considerable

developments in the United States both in regard to the position and social progress of negroes and to the temper of public opinion in regard to colour questions. But the increase of concern with these questions in South Africa during quite recent years is bringing into play superstitious and hysterical apprehensions founded on premises of a very similar kind. This fact is conspicuous to instructed observers even at a distance, and I am interested to see that a writer [1] on social questions who has visited America recently after twenty years' residence in South Africa is impressed with the fact that much more intelligence and good sense with regard to such problems are now shown in America than in South Africa.

I myself was led to examine during visits to the United States, in what respects the attitude of white towards coloured differed from that prevailing in our West Indian colonies, and how far such difference in attitude contributed to and explained the greater security and apparent promise of mixed society in the latter. Being convinced that industrial harmony between white and dark races may be established more effectually by human understandings and sympathies than by what the sociologists call "economic interest" or the cash nexus, a fact which, because of the more conspicuous distinctive characteristics of the African temperament, is much more saliently true in regard to the confrontation of white capital with coloured labour than it may be in purely European communities, I think it appropriate to pursue the question of the social adaptability of the African in the light which was thrown upon it by his position in the United States.

I pass over for the present, but shall return to, the charges of the industrial vices of laziness and slovenliness, admitting that there is abundant ground for these, and also for the charges of thievishness and sexual incontinence against the average negro. It may be noted that these imputations are made against the African in all parts of the world, even by his most sympathetic critics. On the other hand, very many examples, both in America and the West Indies, prove that the sons and daughters of the race can transcend these racial propensities. It is abundantly proved

[1] Rev. W. Eveleigh, *The Colour Problem in America and South Africa.*

that the prejudice which difference of skin and repulsive savage habits may have sown, to say nothing of industrial jealousy and the hatred which abides in the injurer against the race he has once oppressed, but now sees free and nominally before the law his equal—cannot be defended by appeal to any insuperable distinction in any category of human quality or capacity: doubt only arises as to whether the exceptional individuals who may be chosen for test comparisons are really of unmixed African blood. If they are, it is nothing to the point that they are exceptions; they suffice to disprove the theory of the negrophobist: the theory which, as held in the Southern States of America and in some parts of the British Empire, comes, in substance, to this—that the negro is an inferior order in nature to the white man, in the same sense that the ape may be said to be so. It is really upon this theory that American negrophobia rests, and not upon the viciousness or criminality of the negro. This viciousness and criminality are, in fact, largely invented, imputed, and exaggerated, in order to support and justify the propaganda of race exclusiveness.

The determined opposition in the United States to the admission of the possibility of "social equality"—such a degree of social and professional equality as I have described as established in the West Indies, springs principally, if not entirely, from two sources, the fear of race mixture by intermarriage, and the fear of economic competition. The first appears to a stranger to be the more active: perhaps because it appeals more to the class who write, or whom he meets in discussion, upon the subject. It is feared that if "social equality" is tolerated, the "poor white" man will be attracted to marry the well-to-do coloured young woman; the "poor white" girl the capable and pushing mulatto. No doubt this probability is greater in the United States, where there is a large "poor white" class, than in the West Indies, where there is little of such a class. But, as I have explained, the social and professional equality attained in the West Indies has not yet eliminated the restraints of racial consciousness in regard to marriage. Nor where there has been interbreeding in those colonies have the effects been at all disastrous to the community, nor where there has been some evil in it, is the evil uncompensated

by distinct advantages. The principal evil, indeed, appears to me to be the grievous and discreditable fact that the offspring of interbreeding are still in some degree, though far less than formerly, liable to be despised and insulted and held in indefensible disparagement by unintelligent and ill-conditioned white people.

It is interesting to observe how experience in the West Indies disproves the theory of American negrophobists that the vices which they impute to the negro as justifying their race-persecution are unchangeably inherent in the race. I was in the United States just before the Presidential election of 1904; and at that time the Southern Press was threatening Mr Roosevelt that he would lose votes in the South, not only because he had allowed Mr Booker Washington, one of the most notable and distinguished coloured men in the nation, to lunch with him, but because, it was alleged, the effect of a Republican administration was to encourage a "saucy" attitude in the negro, whereas the Democrats knew how to keep him in his proper place. On investigating what was meant by a saucy attitude, which editors were not slow quite frankly to explain, it appeared that it meant no more than that the negro was more disposed to assume, under a Republican administration, that he was to be regarded as just as much a human being as the white man, whereas (strange interpretation of the idea of democracy!) it was essential that the community should insist upon the fact that his race, or any admixture of negro race, renders him essentially and permanently different, so that he must ever remain a creature bound by nature to pay respect and yield subservience to white Americans of whatever extraction, no matter what his and their relative qualifications in other categories than those of race may be.

Now, it may be that the United States have produced quite a different type of negro or coloured person from what has been produced by the different conditions in Jamaica. Impudence—sauciness—is an offensive human quality, to be found in great perfection among the city populations of all white communities. London, Paris, New York, Berlin are each hard to beat as schools of their several characteristic sauciness. Doubtless, Nature has not stinted the negro of this common human endowment, and it may

well be that it is more virulently developed by some social conditions than by others. But the phenomenon is not a necessary one. It is not obtrusive in Jamaica. White people there do not suffer from impudence on the part of black or coloured unless it is provoked by bad manners and unwarrantable pretensions. In the matter of natural good manners and civility of disposition the black people of Jamaica are very far, and, indeed, out of comparison, superior to the members of the corresponding class in England, America, or North Germany. Any man or woman who addresses a native Jamaican with reasonable civility and without condescension or arrogance—that is to say, in a rational and proper human manner—will find himself outrun in nine cases out of ten by the natural and kindly courtesy and goodwill of the reply and reception which he will meet with. And the same may be said of Africans in their native countries.

Yet the Jamaican has enough fundamental independence of spirit to resent an uncivil or overbearing address, and such resentment in the uneducated or uncouth person will naturally exhibit itself in impudence or sauciness. In any competition of offensiveness and bad manners the sensitiveness and quick wit of the African tend to give him a decided advantage. Excluding such circumstances, the manners even of the town population are gentler and more agreeable than those which one is accustomed to meet with in most places of European resort. And, generally, in this matter of courtesy, which is essential to the relation of equality, I should be prepared to maintain that African peoples are by the temperament and customs of their races not inferior but superior to the average "Nordic"; and I am forced to attribute the "sauciness" complained of in the negro of the Southern States and elsewhere far more to the attitude which has been taken, and which is maintained towards him, than to any inherent vice in his composition. This courtesy of the African races, which is just as much a characteristic part of their "nature" as is their faculty of self-assertion and insolence, is a very valuable social quality, and it is a great deprivation to any community that such a quality should be destroyed or obscured by social antagonism.

The imputation of impudence to the negro is in great

measure only the reflex of the presumption that difference of race itself constitutes superiority in the white man and entitles him to be treated accordingly. When the negro, entertaining no such presumption and, moreover, finding himself a member of society which professes a civic doctrine of human equality and a religious doctrine of human brotherhood, merely behaves with the frankness and ease appropriate to a member of such a society, he often gives offence as presumptuous. Often, too, no doubt, where this assumption on the part of white men prevails, he behaves with a deliberate self-assertiveness by way of a manifestation against it, or he may occasionally behave objectionably through the reaction of a real "inferiority complex."

The typical and characteristic excess of negrophobist tendency in the United States is exhibited in the lynching and torturing of coloured persons convicted, accused, or suspected of crime; or even on less tangible pretexts or provocations. I do not desire to criticise these extravagances on the score of their special atrocity as methods of social discipline. The normal processes of British criminal law are themselves a nightmare of insane and degrading futility. I am here only concerned with the practice of lynching in regard to its alleged necessity as a terror to coloured offenders on account of their special racial propensities.

"We must protect our Women": that is the formula. It is true that the statistics of lynchings show that by far the greatest proportion of them follow cases of murder or complicity in murder, and only about 20 per cent. cases of sexual assault or attempts at such assault. This plea, therefore, really covers but a small part of the ground. But as it is the last entrenchment of those who advocate differentiation against the negro, and appeals to the same sentiment as does that argument for social injustice as an antidote to the menace of "social equality" with which I have dealt above, it may be useful to examine it in the light of social experience in British West Indian colonies.

Now the plain truth is that in the British West Indies assaults by black or coloured men on white women or children are practically altogether unknown. No apprehension of them whatever troubles society. I say this

having been an administrator familiar with the judicial statistics, a resident familiar with all parts of Jamaica and all classes of its population, the head of a household of women and girls who have frequented the suburbs of Kingston, and lived for weeks and months in remote country districts with neither myself nor any other white man within call. Any resident in Jamaica will tell the same story. A young white woman can walk alone about the hills or down from them to Kingston, in daylight or dark, through populous settlements of exclusively black or coloured folk, without encountering anything but friendly salutation from man or woman. Single ladies may hire a carriage and drive all over the island without trouble or molestation. Offences against women and occasionally against children come into the courts: but they are not against the white women and children. Whatever may be the cause, the fact is indisputable that Jamaica, or any other West Indian island, is as safe for white women to go about in, if not safer than any European country with which I am acquainted. There have been no savage punishments here, no terrorism, no special laws, no illegal discriminations against the coloured. If, then, there is special ground for fearing assaults of this character by coloured on white in America, it clearly cannot possibly be due to any necessary or special propensity of the African race.

I cannot but surmise that any propensity there may be to such assaults in the United States is stimulated by the very character of the attitude of the white towards the coloured population. There is maintained a constant storm of suggestion to the most imaginative and uncontrollable of passions in an excitable and imaginative race. If we had anything like the same amount of suggestion abroad in the British West Indies I should fear that we might begin to hear of these criminal assaults in something like the same proportion to other crime as we hear of them in discussions of the colour-difficulty in the United States. When one class makes to another, whose women it has continually made the mothers of its own offspring, the preposterous and self-condemnatory announcement that it is an animal of an inferior order, so soon it not only arouses all the irrepressible self-assertiveness of the human claim to

equality, which is as fundamental in the African as in any other race, but also introduces a special prompting to the assertion and demonstration of that equality in a category that might otherwise pass as neutral in regard to any such claims. The danger, such as it is, of sexual assaults, is enormously increased, if indeed it is not entirely created, by the extreme race-barrier theory.

CHAPTER VII

THE TRANSPLANTED AFRICAN

III

One of the principal reasons why colour prejudice is stronger in the "black belt" in the United States than it is in the West Indies, and the denial of justice and equal consideration to negroes so much more prevalent, has lain in the operation of the American constitution. The effect of emancipation was to give every adult male negro a vote in all political and municipal elections. Emancipation took place thirty years earlier in the West Indies, and the less difficult and exasperating situation which it set up (few negroes immediately attaining the qualifications prescribed for the franchise) has had so much the longer to develop conciliation, public spirit, and tolerance, and to enable negroes, both by education and by participation in the local affairs of their districts, to acquire political competence for the affairs of a civilised State. The effects of emancipation in the West Indies on the management of the planting industry, which was their principal economic standby, were immediate and far-reaching, but they were not complicated by a political revolution. No overwhelming class of new citizens suddenly endowed with democratic power and unqualified and unprepared for its responsible and efficient exercise was created, as was the case in the United States. In administrative matters there was continuity of authority; and though this authority was that of an employing oligarchy, strong influence for the observance of reasonable and liberal principles was maintained through the British Government and the British public opinion which had effected emancipation. When the grievances of the negroes in Jamaica, of which exclusion from land and class partiality on the part of the white

magistracy were the principal elements, produced the so-called Rebellion of 1865, the political result was not the enfranchisement of the negroes (our own second Reform Bill had not yet been passed), but the extinction of the oligarchical Assembly and the substitution of the benevolent despotism of Crown Colony Government. British constitutional theory did not, as did that of the United States, presume that every adult negro or man of every other race had an unqualified, indefeasible natural right to elect the public administration. It placed responsible power in the hands of the Governor under the instructions of the British Colonial Office controlled by the British Parliament, and thus rendered public policy and administration more amenable to the control of British public opinion than those of a local white oligarchy could be. Since that time the powers of the elected members of the legislature have been by progressive stages increased, and the electoral qualification (which has never made any distinction between white and coloured men, and is now open to women) is now so low as to constitute the present electorate predominantly of negro peasants, who have learnt to exercise it with a good deal of discrimination and prudence. The results of this progressive development have been that the legitimate interests of the whites have been safeguarded and that the black population has had no political racial grievance against the white. The Government has been administered with conscientious regard to the rights and interests of all classes and with a just repression of any disturbing tendencies.

Conditions in the United States have been markedly different. Political power was conferred forthwith on the masses of emancipated slaves; their ignorance, their incapacity, their vanity, the self-assertiveness of their new sense of independence, their ambition, and their cupidity were appealed to by political adventurers, and the exercise of their political power became justifiably a cause of apprehension and actually a source of damage to the class hitherto their masters and rulers. The situation was not met; it could not, under the American constitution, be met in the manner in which it was dealt with in British colonies. The political dangers apprehended and the vagaries mani-

fested by the coloured democracy were met and fought by underhand, unjust, and violent methods. In politics the constitution was strained and the voting system openly tampered with and set at naught. These methods continue in operation to this day. In judicial matters resort was had to popular violence and terrorism against the negro. The coloured people of the United States not only have ostensible grievances but are continually made to feel their grievances more acutely. Their intelligence, their critical and executive power, their prosperity and business activities have advanced, and are advancing rapidly, and they appreciate the significance of their position the more and more keenly. The tendency of the Southern Press and the Southern whites is still to urge their exclusion from equal consideration in politics or in social practice. There is in the United States not only a democratic political franchise of manhood suffrage for the State and the National legislatures, but a Civil Service and a Judicial Bench, the appointments to which rest also in theory on the votes of the citizens. We in England consider these institutions of an elective Civil Service and an elective judiciary to indicate a mistake in constitution building; but it would seem to us a still greater mistake to suppose such arrangements workable in a community of which the majority of electors were newly freed plantation negro slaves, or even a population on the level of the contemporary Jamaica peasant. It was naturally and practically inevitable in the United States that such a situation, when it arose, should be judged intolerable by the whites of the South, and that the American constitution being in fact unworkable without disaster under such conditions, its provisions should have been evaded by methods constitutionally improper and dishonest. If the same mistake had been made in any British community, similar violence, if not by the same methods, would doubtless have been done to the constitution. Our Imperial constitution is, in fact, more flexible and more accommodating than that of the United States, especially in regard to the theory of the rights and powers of the Crown in legislating for communities not having responsible Government. The form of the American constitution, purporting to assert full and equal rights of citizenship for all adult males, gives coloured

men a permanent plea of injustice when those rights are ignored in practice, and places the white in the permanent false situation of holding, by violent and unconstitutional means, a position which may be socially justifiable and which has proved in the history of the West Indies to be favourable, if justly administered, to the advance of the coloured people. Such a situation, denying as it does the paramountcy of justice, and openly setting at naught the principles of constitutional law, is acutely demoralising to white and black alike. In order to defend it the minority are constrained to vilify the character of the coloured people and disparage their abilities by all manner of misrepresentations. It not only foments and stimulates the hysteria which finds vent in the exaggerated suggestions of outrageous propensities in the negro and in those outbursts of the lust of blood and torture manifested in lynchings; it sets up a social terrorism and obscurantism within the white community which spreads, as such mob-hallucinations constantly tend to spread, into a formula of national patriotism. Just as when this country has been at war any English man or woman who has kept a cool head has been liable to be pilloried as a pro-Boer or a pro-Hun, so in America any person within the black belt who ventures to attribute human equality to a coloured citizen is dubbed a "negrophilist" (as it were one enamoured of the black man as such), and his arguments are put out of court as those of a social outcast and traitor. The pressure of the terrorism so exercised by the bullies and time-servers who form, in seasons of panic, the articulate section of every social community, is so great that many sane-minded men in America, as in South Africa, keep silence, or at best half silence, in the face of an increasing negrophobia which threatens to become a national danger.

Negrophobia—prejudice against African racials—is in mixed communities a most active source of danger, because, so far as a more wholesome and more hopeful balance has been attained in any such communities, it has always been brought about through the steadfast exclusion from the public policy of the state of all regard to racial distinctions. The civilisation and morality in some respects of the Jamaica negro may not be high, but he stands on a markedly

different level from his grandfather, the plantation slave, and his great-grandfather, the African tribal native. The negro in Jamaica has been so far raised, so much freedom of congenial civic mixture between the races has been made acceptable, by the continuous application to the race of the doctrines of humanity and equality: equality, that is, in the essential sense of endowment in the infinite, of shareholding in the spiritual soul of man; of sonship in the family of God. Evangelical Christianity, most democratic of doctrines, and educational effort, inspired and sustained by conviction and recognition that, whatever the surface distinctions, there was fundamental community and an equal claim in the Black with the White to share, according to individual capacity and development, in all the inheritance of humanity—these, chiefly, have created the conditions that have done what has been done for the negro in the lands of his exile. The improvement, the advance, have not come automatically. They had to be fought for (and they have still to be fought for) by men and women who believed in their principles and who did not believe in any finality and supremacy of racial distinctions and disabilities. This is not theory; it is history. Emancipation, education, identical justice, perfect equality in the law courts and under the constitution, whatever the law of the constitution may be, these take away the sting of race difference, and, if there is racial backwardness, it is not burdened with an artificial handicap. Negroes are now incontestably the equals of many white men in fields of human function in which a hundred years ago slave-owners would have confidently pronounced the negro incapable of making and holding any place. All such positive and realised progress has been made by ignoring the obvious; by refusing to accept as conclusive the differences and the disabilities, by believing in the identities, the flashes of response and promise; by willing that there should be light where there seemed to be no light; by the methods of the visionary whose kingdom is not of this world, but who is undissuadably bent on assimilating the world to that kingdom; but in part by far less than this, by the mere resolute maintenance in the state of principles of common justice. The vast transplantation of slavery, the intercourse of white and

black which has arisen out of it, have in fact brought advance in humanity to the slaves' descendants. This has been done, and done only, and further advance towards health in a mixed community can only be looked for by adherence to the attitude, or more fundamentally through the personal recognition and consciousness, of human equality. Whatever race prejudices may dictate, statesmen and educated observers of social history at least cannot fail to recognise this; and to recognise that to set up the opposite principle, the allegation of inequality, of insuperable race differences and inferiority, and to take this principle as a guide for internal social or economic policy is a sin against light that is certain to aggravate the disorders of any mixed community, as it is to-day still demoralising the Southern States of the American Union and threatening to destroy South Africa.

The colour line is not a rational line; the logic neither of words nor facts will uphold it. If its theory is adopted it infallibly aggravates the virulence of the colour problem. The more it is ignored the more is that poison attenuated. It is quite possible to justify a political generalisation—not as a principle, but as a working formula—that where the majority of the population are uncivilised or uneducated negroes it is expedient to restrict the political franchise by minimum qualifications applicable to the whole community. It is not possible, either as a working political formula, or as an anthropological theorem, to establish a generalisation that there is any political or any human function for which coloured persons are by their African blood proved disqualified. In various categories of human activity it may be maintained that, as a rule, and very naturally, for the activities of a State of European civilisation, black and coloured folk are not up to the average efficiency of white, and are difficult and disheartening to deal with. On the other hand, in other categories they often are manifestly more generously endowed than the average of the white men who intermix with them, not only with sympathetic and valuable and human qualities, but with talent and executive ability for their expression.

My study and observation of comparative conditions in the United States and in the West Indies, and of all that

can be learnt from a long series of reports of many public investigations that have been held since the Boer War into South African native problems, have long convinced me and progressively confirmed me in the assurance that no solution of American or South African difficulties will be found except by resolutely disclaiming the colour line and race differentiation theory. American and European politicians and business-men cannot be expected to adopt the formulas and methods of Evangelical Christian missionaries or to sympathise with all their political programmes. But the fact cannot be ignored that the faiths of the men, for the most part missionaries of the Free Churches, who laid the essential foundations for a peaceful development of the mixed community of Jamaica were democratic and humanitarian, and before all else uncompromisingly Christian, and that not vaguely or loosely, in the sense of mere kindness, but in the sense of that revelation of the nature and inheritance of man which gave Christianity power to undermine the enormous brutalities and animalisms of the Roman Empire. No more than this is required in regard to temperamental attitude. Where the race differentiation formula is held to it must increase civil discord. Where the balance of numbers is as it is in South Africa it must tend to foster obscure preparations for rebellion or civil war. If statesmen and citizens face in the contrary direction I will not say they will immediately attain civil peace, but I am confident that they will be travelling the only road towards it.

CHAPTER VIII

AMERICAN CORROBORATIONS

THE substance of the preceding three chapters, in which I have compared racial relations in Jamaica with those prevailing in the United States, was published, with some additional commentary, in an American Review in April 1905. The statements made as to the better relations attained in the British Colony were such as American citizens might at that date have reasonably been expected to receive with some scepticism. The facts are so important that I am glad to have been able to substantiate my own impressions by quoting those of two well-known American writers who have, since my observations appeared, quite independently but very precisely endorsed them.

Mrs Ella Wheeler Wilcox, writing from Jamaica (which she has visited several times) to the *New York American*, spoke as follows:—

> "The man or woman who visits Jamaica and does not acknowledge the ability of the coloured race to occupy positions of dignity and trust, and to acquire education and culture, is either blind or utterly pig-headed.
>
> "Three coloured men acted on the jury in Kingston this week. The policemen, the trolley and railway officials are coloured; so are the post-office officials. Scores of men stamped with the indelible marks of the African occupy prominent places in large industrial concerns, and the most remarkable man teacher I ever met with is Mr —— of ——, Principal of the —— Schools, and a man of very dark, albeit of very handsome, features.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> "There is no question but the coloured man is more evenly developed and better treated, better understood on this island than anywhere in America.
>
> . . . . . .

"Nowhere has the man with coloured blood in his veins a better opportunity to rise in the world than right here. Stay here—and prove to all "doubting Thomases" what the coloured race can do. It is miraculous to think what it has accomplished here in sixty-eight years, since slavery was abolished.

"What may it not achieve in the next half-century?"

Dr Josiah Royce, Professor of Psychology in Harvard University, in an otherwise notable article on "Race Questions and Prejudices," published in the *International Journal of Ethics*, from which I shall have occasion to quote again hereafter in support of the views of these questions which experience has impressed upon myself, has written at some length on the topics which I have discussed in these chapters on "The Transplanted African." His testimony is so explicit, and, coming independently from such a source, so significant and so weighty that I think it useful to quote the following somewhat lengthy extracts. They are particularly and very closely relevant to-day (1928) to the negrophobist policy that is being shaped by the present Administration of South Africa, and that is why I reproduce them so fully:

"How can the white man and the negro, once forced, as they are in our South, to live side by side, best learn to live with a minimum of friction, with a maximum of co-operation? I have long learned from my Southern friends that this end can only be attained by a firm, and by a very constant and explicit insistence upon keeping the negro in his proper place, as a social inferior—who, then, as an inferior, should, of course, be treated humanely, but who must first be clearly and unmistakably taught where he belongs. I have observed that the pedagogical methods which my Southern friends of late years have found it their duty to use, to this end, are methods such as still keep awake a good deal of very lively and intense irritation, in the minds not only of the pupils but also of the teachers.

"Must such increase of race-hatred first come, in order that later, whenever the negro has fully learned

his lesson, and aspires no more beyond his station, peace may later come? Well, concerning just this matter I lately learned what was to me, in my experience, a new lesson. I have had occasion three times, in recent summers, to visit British West Indies, Jamaica and Trinidad, at a time when few tourists were there. Upon visiting Jamaica I first went round the coast of the island, visiting its various ports. I then went inland, and walked for miles over its admirable country roads. I discussed its condition with men of various occupations. I read some of its official literature. I then consulted with a new interest its history. I watched its negroes in various places, and talked with some of them, too. I have since collected such further information as I had time to collect regarding its life, as various authorities have discussed the topic, and this is the result:

"Jamaica has a population of surely not more than 14,000 or 15,000 whites, mostly English. Its black population considerably exceeds 600,000. Its mulatto population, of various shades, numbers, at the very least, some 40,000 or 50,000. Its plantation life, in the days before emancipation, was much sadder and severer, by common account, than ours in the South ever was. Both the period of emancipation and the immediately following period were of a very discouraging type. In the sixties of the last century there was one very unfortunate insurrection. The economic history of the island has also been in many ways unlucky even to the present day. Here, then, are certainly conditions which in some respects are decidedly such as would seem to tend towards a lasting state of general irritation, such as would make, you might suppose, race-questions acute. Moreover, the population, being a tropical one, has serious moral burdens to contend with of the sort that result from the known influences of such climate upon human character in the men of all races.

"And yet, despite all disadvantages to-day, whatever the problems of Jamaica, whatever its defects, our own present Southern race-problem in the forms which we

know best simply does not exist. There is no public controversy about social race equality or superiority. Neither a white man nor a white woman feels insecure in moving about freely amongst the black population anywhere on the island.

"The negro is, on the whole, neither painfully obtrusive in his public manners nor in need of being sharply kept in his place. Within the circles of the black population itself there is meanwhile a decidedly rich social differentiation. There are negroes in Government service, negroes in the professions, negroes who are fairly prosperous peasant-proprietors, and there are also the poor peasants; there are the thriftless, the poor in the towns,—the beggars. There is a small class of negroes who are distinctly criminal. On the whole, however, the negro and coloured population, taken in the mass, are orderly, law-abiding, contented, still backward in their education, but apparently advancing. They are generally loyal to the Government. The best of them are aspiring, in their own way, and wholesomely self-conscious. Yet there is no doubt whatever that English white men are the essential controllers of the destiny of the country. But these English whites, few as they are, control the country at present with extraordinary little friction, and wholly without those painful emotions, those insistent complaints and anxieties, which at present are so prominent in the minds of many of our own Southern brethren. Life in Jamaica is not ideal. The economic aspect of the island is in many ways unsatisfactory. But the negro race-question, in our present American sense of that term, seems to be substantially solved. How has this been brought about?

"I answer, by the simplest means in the world—the simplest, that is, for Englishmen—viz. by English administration, and by English reticence. When once the sad period of emancipation and of subsequent occasional disorder was passed, the Englishman did in Jamaica what he had so often and so well done elsewhere. He organised his colony; he established good local courts, which gained by square treatment the

confidence of the blacks. The judges of such courts were Englishmen. The English ruler also provided a good country constabulary, in which native blacks also found service, and in which they could exercise authority over other blacks. Black men, in other words, were trained, under English management, of course, to police black men. A sound civil service was also organised; and in that educated negroes found in due time their place, while the chief of each branch of the service were or are, in the main, Englishmen. The excise and the health services, both of which are very highly developed, have brought the law near to the life of the humblest negro, in ways which he sometimes finds, of course, restraining, but which he also frequently finds beneficent. Hence he is accustomed to the law; he sees its ministers often, and often, too, as men of his own race; and in the main, he is fond of order, and to be respectful, towards the established ways of society. The Jamaican negro is described by those who know him as especially fond of bringing his petty quarrels and personal grievances into court. He is litigious just as he is vivacious. But this confidence in the law is just what the courts have encouraged. That is one way, in fact, to deal with the too forward and strident negro. Encourage him to air his grievances in court, listen to him patiently, and fine him when he deserves fines. That is a truly English type of social pedagogy. It works in the direction of making the negro a conscious helper towards good social order.

"Administration, I say, has done the larger half of the work of solving Jamaica's race-problem. Administration has filled the island with good roads, has reduced to a minimum the tropical diseases by means of an excellent health-service, has taught the population loyalty and order, has led them some steps already on the long road 'up from slavery,' has given them, in many cases, the true self-respect of those who themselves officially co-operate in the work of the law, and it has done this without any such result as our Southern friends nowadays conceive when they think of what is called 'negro domination.' Administration has allayed

ancient irritations. It has gone far to offset the serious economic and tropical troubles from which Jamaica meanwhile suffers.

"Yes, the work has been done by administration—and by reticence. You well know that in dealing, as an individual, with other individuals, trouble is seldom made by the fact that you are actually the superior of another man in any respect. The trouble comes when you tell the other man too stridently that you are his superior. Be my superior quietly, simply showing your superiority in your deeds, and very likely I shall love you for the very fact of your superiority. For we all love our leaders. But tell me that I am your inferior, and then perhaps I may grow boyish, and may throw stones. Well, it is so with races. Grant, then, that yours is the superior race. Then you can afford to say little about that subject in your public dealings with the backward race. Superiority is best shown by good deeds and by few boasts.

"So much for the lesson that Jamaica has suggested to me. The widely different conditions of Trinidad suggest, despite the differences, a somewhat similar lesson. Here also there are great defects in the social order; but again, our Southern race-problem does not exist. When, with such lessons in mind, I recall our problem, as I hear it from my brethren of certain regions of our Union, I see how easily we can all mistake for a permanent race-problem a difficulty that is essentially a problem of quite another sort. Mr Thomas Nelson Page, in his recent book on the *Southerners' Problem*, speaks in one notable passage of the possibility, which he calls Utopian, that perhaps some day the negro in the South may be made to co-operate in the keeping of order by the organisation under State control of a police of their own race, who shall deal with blacks. He even mentions that the English in the East Indies use native constabulary. But this possibility is not Utopian. When now I hear the complaint of the Southerner, that the race-problem is such as constantly to endanger the safety of his home, I now feel disposed to say: 'The problem that endangers the sanctity of

your homes, and that is said sometimes to make lynching a necessity, is not a race-problem. It is an administrative problem. You have never organised a country constabulary. Hence when various social conditions, amongst which the habit of irritating public speech about race-question is indeed one, though only one condition, have tended to the producing and to the arousing of extremely dangerous criminals in your communities, you have no adequate means of guarding against the danger. When you complain that such criminals, when they flee from justice, get sympathy from some portion of their ignorant fellows and so are aided to get away, you forget that you have not first made your negro countrymen familiar with and fond of the law, by means of a vigorous and well-organised and generally beneficent administration constantly before his eyes, not only in the pursuit of criminals, but in the whole care of public order and health. If you insist that in some districts the white population is too sparse or too poor, or both, to furnish an efficient country constabulary constantly on duty, why, then, have you not long since trained black men to police black men? Sympathy with the law grows with responsibility for its administration. If it is revolting to you to see black men possessed of the authority of a country constabulary, still, if you will, you can limit their authority to a control over their own race. If you say all this speech of mine is professorial, unpractical, Utopian, and if you still cry out bitterly for the effective protection of your womankind, I reply merely, look at Jamaica. Look at other English colonies.

"In any case, the Southern race-problem will never be relieved by speech or by practices such as increase irritation. It will be relieved when administration grows sufficiently effective, and when the negroes themselves get an increasingly responsible part in this administration in so far as it relates to their own race. That may seem a wild scheme. But I insist: It is the English way. Look at Jamaica, and learn how to protect your own homes."

CHAPTER IX

THE UNCOLONISED AFRICAN

In South Africa, in America, and in the West Indies the white man has settled for residence and has developed, or imported ready developed, his system of capitalised production based upon wage labour. He had begun operations in both continents, in the First Colonial Period, by introducing through the agency of commercial joint-stock companies batches of European colonists, at the Cape of Good Hope, in Florida, Virginia, Louisiana, and elsewhere, to whom, through the agency of other joint-stock companies, or merchant-adventurers, chiefly British, he supplied negro slaves, kidnapped in West Africa through British, French, and Dutch trading-posts and through the Portuguese in Angora. Plantation slavery, it is a fact to be noted and borne in mind, arose not from invading conquest and the settlement of better-armed invaders binding the natives to the soil, but through the deliberate enterprise of capital seeking profit, with investors as sleeping partners, as shareholders in African development syndicates are to-day. The Dutch East India Company did not allow their settlers at the Cape to make slaves of the Hottentot natives. But throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries European and particularly British settlements in West Africa were fortified trading-posts and "factories," with capacious dungeons, and formed part of the organised system of exploitation in which the African colonies furnished a market for British goods, the payment for which was received to a small extent in native products such as gold, ivory, dyewoods, beeswax, gum, etc., but principally in the raw material of human labour in the form of slaves. These slaves were supplied to the West Indian and New World plantations and also to the Cape Colony, though

the Cape had an alternative source of supply in East Africa and in the Malay Archipelago. The trade circuit completed itself by the shipment to the home country of sugar, tobacco, and other produce grown by this labour in the West Indies and America. The West Indies were cherished as the most valuable of our tropical possessions, and the West African settlements as important principally through their supply of slave labour to the West Indies. That system became discredited, and as a legally recognised institution was destroyed, partly through its own economic weaknesses, as was shown with regard to the Southern States of America by Cairnes in his book *The Slave Power*, but most conspicuously through the political action of the British and United States Governments (in the latter case after a civil war) in abolishing slavery. This action impoverished the white colonists, who, even where, as in South Africa, they could have worked themselves, had been tutored by slavery to consider labour unseemly for white men. Emancipation ruined many planters in the West Indies and in the Southern States; it conduced to accelerate the emigration of Boer farmers into Natal, the Orange Free State, and the Transvaal, and where it was superseded a new industrial dispensation has had to construct itself. The West Indies have not recovered and will never recover their former renowned position as fields for the investment of capital in planting industry, partly because sugar has been cheapened by European manufacture, and coffee, cocoa, tobacco, and others of their characteristic products are grown in abundance elsewhere. The Southern States of America are only recovering it through manufacturing industrial development. Mineral oil has attracted some capital to Trinidad, but the Island remains predominantly agricultural, and cane-farming has superseded estate-cultivation. Diamonds, gold, platinum, copper, coal, and other minerals, and the contributory development of railways and other subsidiary forms of capitalised industry, have established enormous investments in South Africa. But in South Africa, as elsewhere, the abolition of predial slavery disorganised agriculture, and, though many of the colonists betook themselves to a form of pastoral industry which demanded little labour, South African farmers have

had difficulties, though not so great as in the West Indies, about labour supply ever since, which they have dealt with by oppressive forms of law. In West Africa the conditions are very different. Although Europeans have long had commercial as well as slave-trading interests there, they have never established domiciled colonies. The white man cannot make a home there; he cannot bring up his children. The coastal lands are not, for the most part, suitable for estate agriculture, nor could establishments of native slaves have been maintained. They could always run away. These circumstances have also prevented the establishment of plantations in such interior territory as was later annexed and policed. The early settlements there, prior to Sierra Leone, which was established as a dumping-ground for destitute freed slaves and British prostitutes, were merely trading depots. The coastal regions were ruined and destroyed for native life by the reactions of the slave-trade, and its ravages extended far inland, depopulating and barbarising large areas. The natives of the interior, however, so far as their intertribal wars and habits of mutual plunder, encouraged and stimulated by the slave-trade, permitted, have always been glad to trade with white men, provided they did not act intrusively. Their exports have been mainly raw produce, either growing wild or requiring little skill for its cultivation. Their direct labour for white men has been chiefly as boatmen, stevedores, and porters in the handling of exports and imports. Practically nowhere has the white sought their services in agricultural or manufacturing labour in their own country under his own direction for the production of the trade staples. The establishment of reef-mining for gold is of recent origin, for tin and other minerals even more recent. The labour problems characteristic of capitalist production have therefore hardly developed. The relations and the difficulties between employers and employees have been only those incidental to casual employment, and the troubles have been confined, as a rule, to strikes of Kroo boys or carriers. In regard to contracts for periods of such labour entered into by these classes, the Masters' and Servants' laws have been very stringent. A carrier breaking his contract might be imprisoned for a year, with hard labour. This method

for repressing labour disputes survives, though perhaps with less drastic sanctions, as I shall mention again, very generally to this day in Africa. West African inland settlements or factories are, as a rule, merely stations to which imported goods are carried to be exchanged for native produce and where the latter are collected and prepared and packed for export. Enterprising and humanely enlightened firms such as Lever's and Cadbury's are now extending and improving factory centres of this character on a basis of quite voluntary labour and on lines attractive and beneficial to the natives who concentrate there.

The partition of Western Africa among European nations, and the appropriation of the interior territories which has been effected within living memory, was actuated for the most part by the aim of securing these districts as markets and of increasing trade upon the lines of the established traditional intercourse conducted through the coast settlements. Only to a small extent for mining, and hardly at all (at any rate in the territories annexed by Great Britain) with any view to planting enterprise, was any direct agricultural exploitation contemplated. (Germany did, in her new colonies of the Cameroons and Tanganyika, establish capitalised plantations.) In the British protectorates and possessions in West Africa the Crown has, therefore, not assumed the ownership of the soil, as the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council has pronounced that it has done in South-East and East Africa (where land exploitation was aimed at), and the land remains recognisedly the property of native tribes who are restrained from its alienation in the form of private ownership. The leasing of land by the tribal authorities for mining purposes, and in certain cases for agricultural purposes, has been safeguarded by legislation or Orders in Council insuring desirable limitations and providing for reasonable payment to the chiefs of the tribes concerned. Where these principles have been adhered to, the danger of oppression in dealings with native tribes is greatly restricted. Capital has no control over labour so long as labour has land on which it can support itself. And the African agriculturalist can usually do this: for he grows his own food. In the Congo Free State, German Cameroons, and other non-British West African territories, ownership

in the land has been assumed by the annexing Government, and land has been extensively alienated to the control or ownership of exploiting companies. This has also been done under British Government in Rhodesia, Nyasaland, and Kenya, where the policy of Capitalist Imperialism was deliberately adopted; thus establishing that firmer basis for pressure upon the natives for labour supply which is congenial and indeed indispensable to the capitalist system of exploitation.

So long as the relations of European nations with native tribes in West Africa were restricted to trade, and to those casual services which I have mentioned in connection with trade, the relation between the employing and the employed classes was ostensibly one of free contract. Apart, however, from questions of the equity of such contracts as the native was induced to enter into, requisitions for forced labour for porterage, etc., might be arbitrarily made under public authority through the chiefs, either by means of Government order or corrupt bargaining; but in general the employer was not in a position to put any compulsion upon the employee beyond the limit of the latter's own desires, nor was he in a position to increase the latter's desire of employment by means of taxation or by excluding him from access to land. Most of the operations of British administration in these countries, and doubtless much of those of other European Governments also, has been devoted to the aim of opening up the countries for legitimate trade. Much energy certainly has been applied to the establishment of good government and civilisation; but the primary purpose of trade has also sometimes been promoted with a certain degree of violence, for the inhabitants have not, as a rule, desired the intrusion of the white man into their country. More especially the armed native tribes, who lived by the exploitation of the less bellicose parts of the population, did not desire such intrusion. All they wanted of the white man was firearms and gunpowder. In these circumstances unprovoked attacks upon peaceable Europeans sometimes occurred, which led to retaliation and the destruction of the attacking or recalcitrant native power. The ultimate result of these operations, which now are largely a thing of the past, has unquestionably been to increase the liberty,

prosperity, and domestic industry of the average of the population, and to set free an increasing volume of producing and trading enterprise among them. Within these bounds, at any rate, the contact of the white man with these countries has been both socially and economically advantageous to their populations, and does not necessarily involve any oppression.

One of the first essentials for the peaceful improvement of the conditions of native life in Africa is the making of railways and roads. There can be little question of the necessity for this and of its advantage to the native populations, quite apart from the trading profits which it brings or promises to white enterprise, and the prospects of which are the active incentive to imperial authorities to pursue that policy. But the railways and the roads have not been and are not being built by free labour. "The supply of voluntary labour," writes Mr Ormsby-Gore,[1] "for these purposes has always proved inadequate in Nigeria. All the railways and most of the roads have involved the use of this compulsory labour. At the end of 1924" (under the British Labour Government) "it was decided to stop the use of compulsory labour on the construction of the Eastern railway in Zaria Province, and to rely solely on voluntary labour. As a result, construction was slowed down, and it had to be stated that the voluntary scheme proved a complete failure, and enlisted labour had again to be secured." Why "*had*"? That little word begs the crucial question as to the pace at which "development" is to be forced on these countries at the expense of the native's toil.

The legitimacy and the limitations of this mode of obtaining labour are now under consideration through the agency of the International Labour Office. Its expediency and justification are manifestly debatable. The argument for regarding this corvée as a legitimate public impost is that the work is of general benefit to the natives. The argument needs closer examination; but, on the whole, there can be little question that conditions of life for the majority of African natives are improved by the intervention of

[1] Report by the Hon. W. G. A. Ormsby-Gore on his visit to West Africa during the year 1926 [Cmd. 2744].

disinterested European administration, and that so long as the institutions of native law and government are not vexatiously interfered with, but are used and encouraged as a scaffolding of the social life of the people, the superposition of European sovereignty and the opening up of the country need have little directly disastrous effect.

Indirectly, however, the pacification and opening up of these countries tends inevitably to weaken the native tribal systems, where they exist, by rendering it more easy for individuals to leave the control and protection of their chiefs, to exempt themselves from their public tribal duties, to drift down to the coast and find casual employment about the coast towns, or to hire themselves in the mines, where mines exist. And they lose, without any substitute, the support of their families in old age and sickness.

The history of what took place in the "Congo Free State," before it was superseded by the Belgian Government, which was paralleled in a milder degree in the French Congo, is typically illustrative of the methods in which white capital may conduct its operations when it breaks away from the old West African trading idea and endeavours to force native production. The traditional products of West Africa up to the period of the Partition were natural staples, the value of which, in proportion to their bulk and quantity, was not, except in the case of gold and ivory, very considerable. It was a steady trade, the feeding of which could be left to the enterprise and self-interest of the natives, not yielding sufficient profit to make it possible for white men to engage actively in production, or even worth while for them to attempt forcible pressure upon the natives. But the development of the demand for rubber —a product of high value in proportion to bulk—introduced in these territories a new policy into European relations with the African. The system of the Congo Free State was to grant concessions of territory to exploiting companies, whose officers organised there a direct system for the extraction of rubber from African forests by compulsion and punishment of the natives. There was advanced in the report of the European Commission which inquired into this system and which led to the supersession of the Free State a kind of grotesque pretence that this procedure

was based upon philanthropic policy, that it was a shouldering of the White Man's Burden. The precise form of argument with which we have since then become very familiar in discussions about the dealings of Europeans with natives in South and East Africa was gravely propounded, namely, that the indolence of the natives needed to be abated and the appreciation of the "dignity of labour" instilled into their minds, that the native has to be civilised by being taught to work, and, moreover, that it was right that he should pay taxes, in return for the benefits conferred on him by the administration in setting up the machinery for this educative process. A hierarchy of extortion was organised. A district, a tribe, a village, a family, was assessed and required to produce a certain quantity of rubber every fortnight. Collective responsibility was insisted on, and was enforced by collective punishment. That is to say, if a particular group assessed did not at the proper time deliver the required amount of rubber, any member of that group—man, woman, or child—that could be laid hold of was liable to be shot, flogged, or mutilated by the officers of a special police of slave-hunters and cannibals enrolled for the purpose. Family fines were exacted in the form of the amputation of children's fingers. This was a system very simple and direct in its conception. It was a kind of inversion of the old slave-trade. The slave-trade took Africans to plantations where Europeans could live, and made them work there, under the lash if necessary, to produce wealth for their owners. The improvement of arms of precision, quick-firing guns, and similar superiorities, had now enabled the white man, impelled by the same purpose, to venture into African territory, and, without taking upon himself the risks of settlement or the discredit of being in law and fact a slave-owner, to compel the negro folk to extract for him there from the forest the wealth that he desired. This system, as it was elaborated in the Congo Free State, was perhaps the most remarkable and typical exhibition of the acute operation of modern capitalist exploitation of African labour in simplified form available for observation within our own time; but the essential principles of its method still flourish with acceptance and credit in other African territories.

Of the similar system established in the Putumayo District on the Amazon River in South America, Mr H. W. Nevinson[1] writes:

> "Roger Casement's Report upon the methods of rubber collection in the Putumayo region is the most appalling revelation of human abomination known to me, though I have witnessed much abomination myself, and have read the records of the Congo Reform Association of which Lord Cromer was Chairman."

A distinct variety of such operations is still extant in the system of indentured labour carried on for the Portuguese cocoa plantations of the islands of San Thomé and Principe. This has been very fully described and analysed in Mr H. W. Nevinson's *A Modern Slavery*. The system was nominally not slavery; but the enrolment of labourers was practically enforced enlistment, the services of the natives enrolled being purchased under pressure from their tribal chiefs, whilst those indentured had and have to this day no means of returning home at the expiry of their contracts, and are under servile compulsion during the period of their service. In effect, the results of the system are indistinguishable from chattel slavery of a markedly stringent type.

[1] *Last Changes, Last Chances*, Nisbet & Co., 1928, p. 94.

CHAPTER X

INDENTURED IMMIGRATION

I HAVE referred to the system of rubber-collection which grew up in the Congo Free State under capitalist enterprise and the servile indentured-labour system of San Thomé and Principe, still only very partially reformed, not in order to throw special discredit upon the colonial methods of particular nations, and not through any desire to expatiate on cruelties to which publicity has already been given with considerable but not yet complete effect, but because these notorious cases furnished characteristic illustrations of the methods to which capitalist enterprise has deemed it necessary and proper to have recourse when it has taken in hand the exploitation through native labour of the wealth of a country where native economic conditions leave that labour free. It cannot be too often repeated that (in the absence of chattel slavery, which was based on capture and force and maintained by restraint and discipline) where land is not monopolised, no system of oppressive exploitation of labour can be established except through the action or with the countenance or connivance of the Government. Experience shows that wherever the African races are not compelled by exclusion from land, or by compulsion to forced labour directly imposed by the power of a government or procured through the authority of chiefs, their labour for an employer is intermittent and unreliable, and may leave him little margin of profit. Where humane sentiment has forbidden the forcible constraint of African workers and vigilant control has prevented, as that of the British Colonial Office has not always prevented, the application of indirect constraint of natives through taxation or other special devices for artificially increasing their needs, employers have had recourse to the importation under

contract ("indenture") for long terms of service of labourers from India, China, Madeira, or other countries where land is fully monopolised in private ownership, and where a proletarian population presses on the available means of subsistence. The maintenance of the food supply is the primary occupation of tribal Africans and is a socially organised concern. That, and not property, sport, or pleasure, is for them the primary purpose of land. So that, except owing to the intermittent occurrence of famine through drought, no "uncivilised" native in his own village can starve. The compulsion that forced the "indentured" coolie to go from India or China to work assiduously on plantations in foreign lands was ostensibly embodied in the stipulations and penalties under which he consented to place himself when he entered into his contract. But the real compulsion, the need that made him accept these quasi-servile conditions, surrendering his freedom of action for five, or very usually ten, years, was precisely the same as that which induces the English agricultural labourer to work his six or seven days a week from morning till evening for the whole of his active life, at subsistence wages—the alternative, to wit, of starvation. Under pressure of this compulsion, under simple fear of the "sack," the European wage-worker quietly, and as it appears voluntarily, submits to those conditions of discipline and routine to which the indentured Asiatic is held by legal penalties. Where such compulsion is absent, no human being in any country commits himself to the sacrifices of personal liberty habitually required by developed capitalist industry on the part of the workers for whose service it calls.

The system of indentured Indian Labour by which the sugar industry was long maintained in various British colonies has now been abandoned, in concession to the resistance made to it by Indian opinion, so soon as that opinion found means of expression in representative Indian legislative bodies. It is, however, important to recognise clearly the essential significance of this method of labour supply. The characteristic element of all such contracts is that a labourer engages under pain of fine or imprisonment to work continuously for a stated period, sufficient at least to allow the profits of his employer from his labour to repay

the cost of his passages from and back to his home, and the provision of barracks, medical attendance, and other accommodations for him. In British Colonies the Government took steps to provide that where this system was established safeguards were established against oppression and ill-treatment of indentured labourers, by the provision of inspectors and the prosecution of offending employers, just as the State under Acts of Parliament takes similar steps by factory laws and factory inspection at home for the sanitary and humane management of capitalist undertakings under what is called the free wage-system, and as it regulates the contracts and treatment of seamen, who have to serve in conditions very much less free than those of a coolie on a West Indian sugar estate.

I have remarked that no human being would voluntarily submit himself to the conditions habitually required by developed capitalist industry of the workers for whose service it calls. The natives or freed slaves in most of our tropical colonies are not under the compulsion of European proletariates, so the would-be employer has had to send labour agents to where poverty and landlessness, as in India and other recruiting grounds, had placed the common man under even greater necessity than he is in this country. Greater, no doubt, as was requisite to induce him to accept exile, but necessity the same in kind. The servile and detrimental conditions of factory and sweating-shop industry have been mitigated among ourselves only by generations of industrial struggle in which thousands of the workers have suffered and perished untimely, and by a century of organised effort both in the Trade Unions and in Parliament, still far from the achievement of its complete aims. Wherever organised capital employs masses of workers, there, unless there is also control and vigilant intervention under public law, together with completely efficient co-operation among the workers, servile conditions have been and inevitably will be imposed on the wage-working class. Where the workers are lately freed slaves or uncivilised and ignorant African natives, wholly inexperienced in methods of combination for expressing their grievances and defending their interests as workers, the scandals which convinced European communities that both organised Trade Unionism and industrial

legislation are necessary are not recognised, or, if recognised are not heeded, because the workers have no political status and the employers make the laws. Under such conditions the horrors of the early period of our own Industrial revolution repeat themselves, often in aggravated and always in less obvious forms.

The indentured Indian coolie in Trinidad or British Guiana was, in regard to the satisfaction of his daily desires and the attainment of comfort, better off than are many European unskilled workers, but he would not have been so if he had not been protected by the independent powers of the Indian Government and the Colonial Office. Comfort is one thing and freedom another, but there are varying social standards of judgment as to what constitutes freedom: the West Indian negro thought the indentured coolie more of a slave than many disinterested and humane Englishmen did. That is because the economic conditions of the negro's own life were less constrained than those of our proletariat, who regard themselves, as a rule, as the type of free men, and his standard of personal independence was so much the higher. He would quite understand why the Socialist calls our free wage-labour system wage slavery. The protection by the State of indentured labour was not a democratic domestic compulsion as is our own industrial legislation; it was a paternal and humanitarian compulsion, imposed from without by the circumspection of the Indian and British Governments. Without going so far as to suggest that in the absence of these external authorities the condition of indentured labourers in British Colonies would have been as bad as on the San Thomé plantations, it is quite certain that had this protection been absent there would have been a great deal of oppression and cruelty to indentured coolies. Injustices and ugly incidents occurred in our Colonies notwithstanding those safeguards. So it has been, and so it would be again. There is in communities of dominant white men employing coloured labour neither the disinterested humane public opinion, nor the democratic self-interest and organised power to check abuses.

CHAPTER XI

THE IDLENESS OF THE AFRICAN

He is the dog, She is the cat, and They in afternoon-tea talk in England are the servants. (Nowadays perhaps even more often, the organised wage-class generally.) In our tropical dependencies They are the "niggers." And much the same mental attitude towards these various Theys is observable. So it must be whenever any class of human beings is appraised by the standard of servile virtue. The virtue of the servant is to be industrious for the profit of his master. If such industry is not manifested, then he is idle. The African knows better than any other race what servitude is. It has been a familiar institution in his native communities; and his closest and longest apprenticeship to European civilisation has been slavery under white kidnappers. To the African who in his own person and those of his forefathers has passed through that apprenticeship, the fact most continuously alive in his consciousness in relation to white men is that he is not their slave. For, remember—not only was it white men that made his slavery bitterest—it was they, too, that, for a century, were his emancipators; it was they, and especially those who spoke for the power of England, that promised him that slavery should be wholly done away, and told him that the flag of the British Empire was the absolute guarantee of that promise. Mere contact with the white man and his institutions, in the countries where he has been the white man's slave, continually reminds the negro of this. He guards himself, therefore, there, against all that he deems to savour of slavery with a constant jealousy; he resents the unwarrantable claims which the unlicked cubs of a class civilisation habitually and instinctively make on the members of any subordinate class; and perhaps it may be said that,

because the accomplishment of his liberty and the promise of equal consideration are still so fresh in his people's tradition, he gives the white man credit, often, for not expecting subserviences of him which the latter may be apt to think he has a right to expect of the darkie, but which he would certainly not expect of men of his own race or class. The African is exceedingly quick in his detection of such an attitude, and has little respect for its sensibilities.

But no one, it may be said, demands of the black man servile virtues; we demand of him only the industrial virtues of the free European. Well, then, let us waive all suggestion that servile complaisances are demanded of Africans by the European adventurer, merchant, planter, or Government officer; let us repudiate any unpatriotic imputation that servile virtues are ever demanded from the free wage-worker at home. What is the standard of industrial virtue in the white wage-worker with which the behaviour of the black compares so distressingly? To put it most simply: first, it is the habit of the European wage-worker (we may leave out of consideration our other classes) of working steadily at one single kind of occupation for six or five and a half days, at least, out of every seven, and working for practically the whole of each full day. Within recollection his week and his day were habitually much longer. He has had to fight a long and bitter fight for such limitation as has been partly achieved. And, secondly, it is the tradition of the European workman of working with a certain conscience of obligation to give good work for his wage. I do not suggest that this latter tradition is so generally prevalent now as the other. Persons of the same habits of mind or point of view as those who most freely accuse the African in his own countries of idleness, most loudly inveigh at home against the dishonest shirking of the British working-man. But in tropical countries they habitually compare the latter's industrial conscientiousness most favourably with those of the negro; so that we may take it that some relics of these endowments of industrial virtue are still to be recognised as attributable to the white worker, at any rate in some comparative degree.

It is, of course, the fact that the conditions of industrial civilisation, persisting through generations, have established

certain traditional standards of diligence and workmanship which are observed by instinctive habit and unquestioned custom, even where the worker has no personal or sympathetic interest in the product of his work. If this habit is not innate and instinctive, it is early developed by precept and by the influence of the continuous rule of mechanical toil which dominates the life of the civilised wage-worker. And this industrial conscientiousness, however acquired by our workman, is by no means entirely due to the fear of losing his job. I need not expatiate here on the horrors reflected in this industrial instinct. I have only to point out that the criticism which censures the African by this standard habitually assumes that the continuous toil of the European wage-earner is in itself an excellent and desirable thing, and that the perversion of human impulse that can enable a man to enjoy mechanical work irrespectively of any beauty or significance to himself in it is an admirable product of evolution. The African is condemned because he is deficient in these two habits. It is perfectly true that he does not recognise them as virtues. Let that be admitted and well understood, and the reasons why he does not; and we shall be on the way to understand much better than do some of his censors what manner of admissible virtues he has from the point of view of the needs of the society he has to live in.

In the first place, the British workman works his five and a half or six days a week, and if his conditions are fortunate, nine hours (including dinner-time) a day, not primarily from virtue, but from necessity. If he could support himself and his family on a little less labour, even the most austere of industrial moralists would hardly condemn him for doing so. The European, as a rule, works excessively. He does so because, under the present organisation of the production and distribution of wealth, he must do so or starve. If he cannot keep up the pace of the speeded machine, he drops out altogether. The African, working primarily from precisely the same behest of necessity, and not from any idea that labour is virtuous, habitually labours less because less labour will provide him with what he needs. Moreover, his industry is desultory, he has little sentiment of the excellence and efficiency of continuity, of

the claims of a job over the attractions of any passing whim. We must remember that a great part of the white workers' work-time is occupied in providing incomes for other people who do not work, through the tolls of rent, interest, dividends, and profits. This part is mere servitude, and is the sphere of those servile virtues alone with which, as agreed, we have not to deal. Our white worker's industrial virtue can hardly be said to extend beyond the work that he does for his own requirements, profit, and satisfaction; for surely that is all that he would do of his own free will, and virtue is an affair of free will and is not manifested in compulsory functions. The rest of his work is exacted by compulsion of the industrial machine. If the work the white worker does for his own benefit is more than the African's it is simply because he has more needs and desires which he believes he can gratify by means of his earnings: and this fact may afford a suggestive basis for criticism. It may be held that the larger needs and imaginative desires of the European entitle him to be considered a higher man, a more elaborate and admirable creature. But if the test of virtue is willingness to work for the satisfaction of needs, then I cannot myself impute greater virtue to the European, for it is unquestionable that when the African feels the motive sufficient he is a prodigious worker.

The total efficiency of the civilised worker measured in output of wealth (or social utility) is greater on the average than that of the African, but the latter is not disciplined or disposed to the production of *surplus*-value; he does not care to produce, and his circumstances do not compel him or even, often, enable him to produce much more than is necessary for his own maintenance. If this is little, and cannot, in his condition of industrial infancy, be very greatly increased, so that even what he retains for himself is less than what the civilised workman gets, yet it is arguable that the African gets more enjoyment of life and satisfaction out of that little than the civilised wage-earner can get out of his more elaborate pittance. And all the labour devoted by the latter to the production of wealth in excess of what reverts to himself is servile or gratuitous.

The reason why the African, whether at home or in

the West Indies, does not have to work so hard to satisfy his needs, provided always that he has access to land, is that those needs are few and simple, the soil and climate generous in the production of food, except when droughts or storms destroy his food crops and bring him to famine, which no industry of his own can avert. Where land is monopolised against him he has to work harder, and in some cases even to work as regularly as the European. Moreover, there is a common tendency to exaggerate the spontaneous fertility of tropical lands. Enthusiastic visitors to the tropics are constantly amazed at the inefficiency which fails to produce universal opulence in a country where "anything will grow." Such visitors sometimes acquire estates, in order to demonstrate to the indolent Creole what British energy can make of his neglected inheritance. They presently discover that anything, indeed, will grow, provided the rains do not fail; and especially "bush" and weeds, which they have to clean out repeatedly if they are to get any crops; also caterpillars, and scale insects, and moulds, and cotton worms, and other competing forms of life in great abundance. In short, that the prompt and intelligent application of labour is constantly necessary; and even for a black man, under a tropical sun, hard labour is not always inviting or the demand for it opportune.

But we have to consider the further vice alleged against the African that when working for wages he has no industrial probity. Just as—because need and the industrial servitude of civilised proletariats have never drilled him into their mechanical habits of labour—he has no instinct of working continuously and automatically, so he has had no history to produce in him the industrial conscience that calls on the worker to give "fair" work for "fair" pay. With him, through all the history of his race, work for a master has been work under the compulsion of slavery, his free activity has been either co-operative, family, or communal work, or work on his little food-patch; or, where any question of interchange came in, the activity of trade and barter. The African is a born trader. The character of the Kaffir bargain is proverbial. The virtue of the trader is to get much for little; his motto is *Caveat emptor*. Wage-

bargaining and the idea of a duty to fulfil labour contracts for wages were new things to the emancipated slave; the pleasure of getting the best of a deal was ingrained and ineradicable. That is the morality which he applies to a wage-bargain. He has very little feeling of obligation about it. He shows no exceptional racial peculiarity in that. And here we come into touch with one of the reasons for the assertion frequently made that the negro was a better industrial citizen under slavery than he is as a wage-worker. It is not entirely the chagrined lament of the disappointed exploiter. The negro was accustomed to the status and obligations of slavery, and whilst it is true that the status and obligations of plantation slavery were often crueller and less tempered by human and domestic relations than was or is the slavery of African native societies, yet even on the plantation he was confronted with the white man in categories with which he was familiar; the category of force, which he recognised and respected, and the category of affection, particularly the family feeling, so that the slave regarded himself as a member of his owner's family, and truly was so in essential relations far more than any wage-employee in modern European society comes near to being. Therefore, he worked comparatively well: not only from fear of the lash, but for the same reason as his fathers worked—whether as slaves or free men in their native families—that is, from social or conventional obligation, and not from pecuniary interest. When he was removed from the sanction of force by emancipation, and from that of affection and duty by the substitution of wage-labour, he naturally became, from the point of view of the employer who judged him solely as an investment of wages, a very idle and conscienceless person. As I have pointed out, in discussing race-antagonisms, the employer, especially the newcomer, the Scottish overseer, who, as attorney, superseded "Old Mas'er" in the management of so many absentee-owned West Indian estates, judged him only by those parts of his character affecting the interests in which they had common contact, and troubled himself little or not at all to do justice to the rest. And yet it is a commonplace in the West Indies, as in all countries where the idleness and untrustworthiness of the African are often

complained of, that under personal influence he is a capital worker. Some estates will have constant labour difficulties, others hardly any, the difference being principally due to the temperament and intelligence of the employer and his overseers.

Even under these best of conditions, however, in colonies where the negro is under no compulsion of need to work regularly, labour difficulties will arise. The free West Indian negro is not only averse as a matter of dignity to conducting himself as if he were a plantation slave, and bound to work every day, but also enjoys the fun of feeling himself a master. On a big sugar estate, when expensive machinery is running, and the crop has to be worked without stoppage, or on a Jamaica banana plantation, when the steamer has been telephoned at daybreak, and two or three thousand bunches have to be at the wharf by noon, the negro hands will very likely find it impossible to cut canes or fruit that morning. It is not a strike for better conditions of labour; they may have no genuine grievance (though imagination may suggest to them that they have); another day they will turn up all right: but a big concern cannot be run on that basis. That was the root of the demand for indentured labour in the West Indies. It cost more than Island-born labour, but it was at command, and could be set to work when and where required. The indentured Indians did not compete with the negro to his exclusion, they actually maintained the opportunity for his employment. In Jamaica local wages used to be highest in those districts where indentured coolies were employed on banana plantations. That did not mean that coolies were employed because higher wages would otherwise have to be paid to Creole labourers. It meant that a valuable productive industry could be maintained by the organised and manageable coolie labour, which, so established, could employ and pay good wages to the casual Creole labourer, but which, if it had had only that casual and independent labour to rely upon, could not have been established and carried on at all. And much the same was the case with regard to the large Demerara and Trinidad sugar estates that employed indentured labour.

The African, where his inclination is unfettered, is finely

unresponsive to merely economic considerations. It is no use raising his wages to induce him to work four days in the week on an estate instead of three. The probable effect will be to make him work two, seeing that two days at the higher rate will give him all the cash he proposes to hire himself to work for. The rest of his time he finds more valuable to himself in other employment.

The idleness of the African resolves itself, as I have observed him in the West Indies, into this: he has no mechanical habit of industry. He has no feeling of obligation to be industrious for industry's sake, no conception of any essential virtue in labour itself, no pride in gratuitous toil. Moreover, he has never been imbued with the shallow and fallacious illusion, so firmly established in competitive industrial societies, that service can be valued in money. The worker in such countries constantly claims that his work is "worth" so much. We know that its "worth" is simply just what the worker is strong enough in competition to get paid for doing it, and that much of the poorest paid work is in truth the most valuable. But work and money are not yet rigidly commensurable in the consciousness of the African. Half a dollar may be worth one day's work to him, a second half-dollar be worth a second day's work, but a third half-dollar will not be worth a third day's work. A third day's work may seem to him worth two dollars. It is this incommensurability of work with money in his mind (a most valuable and hopeful characteristic) that partly accounts for his apparent lack of conscience towards his employer. Moreover, he lives in climates where toil is exhausting, and rest both easy and sweet. There are few days in the year in England when it is really pleasant to loaf, and the streets of civilised cities are not tempting to recumbent meditation.

These are the negro's deficiencies, judged from the point of view of the European who desires to make use of his labour. From a different point of view, the vicious character of his attitude is not so conspicuous. The African is for the most part an unskilled labourer, but he is strong, and when he is pleased to work he is highly efficient within the limits of his capacities. He works best in gangs under social impulse: he works with extreme industry on his own

small holding, up to the limit of his limited wants. There are no bounds to the trouble he will take in service in which his goodwill or his affection is engaged. The capitalist system of industry has not disciplined him into a wage-slave, and I do not believe that it ever will. I think it more probable that that system, in its attempt to incorporate the African in its wage proletariat will, after all, be defeated. The European wage proletariat and its standards of industrial virtue were only forged by long evolution in conditions arising out of private landlordism and the pressure of climate and poverty. So long as the African has access to the land, and is saved from poverty by the simplicity of his needs and the ease of meeting them, so long the capitalist employer is likely to find his labour unmanageable or at best unreliable under the "free" wage-system.

I shall quote in Chapter XII the testimony of the South African Native Affairs Commissioners of 1905 and of Mr Dudley Kidd in correction of the assertion that South African natives are "hopelessly indolent," and I could adduce much similar evidence: but I must select.

The late Bishop Frank Weston, of Zanzibar, one of those men of genius who have devoted themselves invaluably to missionary work in Africa, and who had a most intimate acquaintance and sympathy with East African natives, states quite uncompromisingly:

> "In fact the African is not idle.
>
> "Even if it were true that Africans were idle, the remedy must not be one that is in itself immoral.
>
> "Some tribes use women for work far more than men, especially war-like tribes. But in many tribes the men work with the women. And the average African has a hard task to get food for himself and his family.
>
> "The call of service to the human race is always valid; but it does not summon a man to work for the enrichment of a small band of commercial foreigners.
>
> "The doctrine that Europeans are justified on commercial grounds in making serfs of the Africans is in itself immoral."

> "*No man who knows what he is talking about*"—writes an experienced public officer now serving in East Africa—"*calls Africans generally lazy*; it is not that they do not work, but that so much of their work is wasted—for example, the African sits up all night to keep wild beasts out of his crop, and has done so for generations: but it is a perfectly simple matter to construct a barrier which these animals will not pass: a dry pack stone wall, thorn or cactus hedge, or the like. Does he do it? Not he—he sits up all night."

This example gives a pertinent illustration of the lines upon which European intelligence and its inventions (such as that, to us, too familiar one of barbed wire) can help in the civilisation of Africans. Its applicability, however, depends upon some permanence of land occupation, involving modified methods of agriculture, and the helping of Africans to improve the efficiency of their exacting, but in many respects amateurish and uneconomical, industry.

In the Report of the Study of East Central and South Africa[1] by the Education Commission organised by the Trustees of the (American) Phelps-Stokes Fund there is a valuable chapter on agriculture in East Africa by Mr L. T. Shantz of the Bureau of Plant Industry in the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Mr Shantz views the operations of both European and African agriculture with a disinterested, professional, and unprejudiced eye.

> "In the region considered," (he says) "there are 22,000,000 native inhabitants, practically all engaged directly and indirectly in agriculture, here used to include both plant and animal industry. It is probably well within the margin of safety to say that 21,000,000, or 95 per cent., have no other livelihood. . . . Many of these people keep animals and nearly all keep goats and chickens. Wherever one goes in East or Central Africa the natives are usually at work either breaking new land, cutting or burning the timber or brush, or planting, weeding, protecting or harvesting the crop. In most cases, where the climate permits, production

[1] *Education in East Africa.* Edinburgh House Press, 2 Eaton Gate, S.W. 1.

is more or less continuous in assuring food supply and also fresh vegetables every day in the year.

"In the occupation of a new country the native may be regarded chiefly as labour to be used in the plantation type of development. . . . Usually some direct or indirect pressure must be brought to bear to ensure this labour; sometimes it is conscripted, as in Portuguese East Africa, or again it is secured indirectly by the levying of head or hut tax. The natives under this system become the labour supply, and ultimately entirely depend upon the white planter for employment. While in some cases the welfare of the native may be carefully guarded, the purpose of the system is not to improve the native as a man, but to maintain him as a cheap labour supply."

On native agricultural methods Mr Shantz says:

"The agricultural methods of the natives in Africa have often been condemned as shiftless, wasteful, and as decreasing the productivity of the country. Again one meets continually the statement that the native knows nothing about crop production. These statements, in a way, reflect the attitude of the European toward the native, the assumption being that since he does not follow our methods and our practices he must be essentially wrong. It is well to bear in mind at the start that very little attention has been given to his methods and practices, and that there is no adequate scientific study of native agriculture on which to base sound conclusions. It must be admitted that he produces the necessary food by his method; that the famines are the result of unfavourable seasons and lack of foresight or accrued capital (as stored food) to carry over the famine period. But it is only our elaborate system for the *distribution* of foods that protects civilised man from the recurrence of famine, and even now there is seldom a time when in some part of our world there is not a shortage of food."

On the other hand, nothing is more common than general statements on the part of European settlers in Africa, or returning visitors, conveying the same impression

as that given by Mrs M. A. Buxton of Kenya, who tells us of the Wakamba tribe that

> "the men took no part in the daily work, for the younger men there were the ngomas (dances) and for the elder long councils and confabulations about the affairs of State and local marriages."

Such impressions are, no doubt, especially true with regard to the pastoral and chiefly pastoral tribes such as the Masai and the Wakamba.

A memorandum was submitted to Sir E. Hilton Young's Commission on East African Federation by the Kavirondo Taxpayers' Welfare Association, setting forth (doubtless with European assistance) the native view on this topic of the African's idleness. Kavirondo is the most populous district of Kenya Colony and its population depends on agriculture. The memorandum complains of what it describes as a "libel" on the men of Africa in very many tribes, and particularly on the men of Kavirondo, commonly promulgated in the form that the men do no work in the native Reserves. They quote the following passage from the report of the East Africa Commission [1] (of which Mr W. A. Ormsby-Gore was Chairman):—

> "The danger is of course lest he neither work on his own land in the Reserves or for wages outside of the Reserves. It is inconsistent with the economic progress of the whole country and with the advance in civilisation of the native of Africa that he should be allowed to stagnate in a native Reserve leaving all the work to the women, the men doing nothing."

The memorandum proceeds:

> "Our Kavirondo men do not leave all the work to the women. The following is a list of some of their main activities:—
>
> "1. The men do all the building of houses and grain stores, and the fencing and upkeep of the Kraals.
>
> "2. The men do all the first breaking up of the soil, both of that cultivated by themselves and of that by the women.
>
> "3. The men have their own fields and the women

[1] [Cmd. 2387, 1925.]

theirs. The men have their own grain stores which are the reserve food stored for the Kraal and are used when the women's store is exhausted.

"4. The men do all the night watching of the crops and the cattle, and it is the men who hunt and try to exterminate the rats, moles, and other pests which attack the crops.

"5. The men find the money for the taxes. What this means in some cases those who collect the taxes little know.

"6. The men are the dressers of the skins which formed the sole dress in the past and are still used by many.

"7. The men made all the stools, all the beds, the wicker-doors, and most of the baskets and the big mats which have many uses in a Kraal, made the bigger pottery, *i.e.* big water-jars, and by river and lake made the canoes, fish-traps, and did the fishing and hunting.

"8. This land was once densely wooded with scrub; men cleared it all. Then the men made the wells, cleared the streams, and provided the water supply.

"9. There are very many cattle in Kavirondo. The men and boys herd them, and it is the men who do all the milking and tending of the cattle in the Kraal.

"10. The care of the women after childbirth is the task of the men.

"11. The men hear all the court cases, and what this entails in an African tribe few Europeans realise. By the attendance of the men at the councils there has been developed in the men of Africa a sense of law and discipline which is of the utmost value.

"12. All the care of the poultry comes on the men. It is not women's work, who do not eat eggs or fowls. There are many fowls to be cared for.

"13. The men do the smiths' work.

"14. The planting of bananas, tobacco, and sugar-cane is the work of the men.

"15. The men take their full share in weeding and harvesting the crops.

"The ordinary man in the Reserves of tribes which are not pastoral only but pastoral and agricultural, as

our people are, are by no means the idlers that the East African Report makes them out to be. Designedly or undesignedly the account of the activities or rather lack of activities of the men which it gives creates an impression favourable to policies of non-African development of the lands of Africa, which tend to take or to wean the men of Africa from occupations in their own Reserves for wage occupations outside of the Reserves, with all that such policies must mean for the break up of our tribal and home life.

"We would like to dissent from the doctrine laid down in the sentence which follows that which we have quoted and repudiated: 'He (the native) must be taught by every means open to Government that as he is no longer required for fighting it is his duty to the community and to himself to work, that unless he is prepared to do a reasonable amount of work on his own account it is his duty to go out to work either for Government or private employers in industrial employment.'

"If any man in the Reserves is paying all his taxes and maintains himself without relief from the Government, we cannot see that there lies upon him any duty to endanger the home and family life by entering the ranks of wage-earners outside of the Reserves. If Government thinks that the men of our Reserves are not doing enough in the way of production of crops which other parts of the world need, the true remedy is rather for the Government to embark on a policy of encouraging the men to build better houses, furnish them better, wear better clothing, to raise the standard of living in every possible way, for they will thus indirectly but no less effectively increase the productivity of the men who know that these things cannot be obtained unless they work harder than their fathers, who did not have these things, worked. To take men out of the Reserves for wage-earning only makes it impossible for the women who remain behind to get any help at all from the man, son or husband, while he is away, and makes worse the burden of which the report evidently wishes to see the women relieved."

CHAPTER XII

LATTER-DAY SOUTH AND EAST AFRICAN HISTORY

In earlier chapters I have written chiefly of negroes studied as labourers in the West Indies and the New World, transplanted and bred there by white men to work for their profit. South and East Africa are peopled chiefly by the "Bantu" division of the negroid African races, itself including many peoples of recognisably distinct tribal characteristics, and very commonly credited with endowments of intelligence and efficiency superior to those of West African negroes. Moreover, whilst many of the West African negro peoples have intermixtures of Mediterranean, Hamite, or Semite blood, this is judged to be more generally the case with most of the Bantu peoples. Notwithstanding the differences in local conditions between South and South-Eastern Africa and the New World and in racial characteristics between Bantu and negro, what has been said with regard to the disposition of the negro in industry is, according to the evidence of South African commentators, substantially true of the Bantu. For an intelligent and sympathetic study of the South African "Kaffir" (we need not occupy ourselves with the Hottentot and the almost extinct Bushman) I would refer to Mr Dudley Kidd's books, *The Essential Kaffir* and *Kaffir Socialism.* The late Mr Maurice Evans' *Black and White in South-East Africa* is also a mine of reliable and enlightened commentary. But the Report of the South African Native Affairs Commission, presented to Parliament in 1905, may be considered still the most important and instructive official document on the South African native, regarded as "labour." Its recommendations are in present-day discussions constantly quoted in support of the lines of policy adopted or proposed in South African Native Affairs legislation. Another much more re-

cent and extremely valuable document is that of the Economic and Wages Commission appointed by the South African Government in 1925, which reported in February 1926. This Report deals much more closely and penetratingly than could the Commissioners of 1905 with the developing results of the operation of capitalist industry in South Africa, with the relations between employers, white workers, and black workers, and with the maturing results of white land monopoly on the position both of landless whites and of natives. Before I deal with the particulars of present conditions exhibited in these documents I will attempt a brief general survey of latter-day African history in its bearings on the relations of Europeans and natives. I apologise for some repetition of what I write elsewhere, for the sake of continuity in this summary. When the scramble for Africa among European nations began to develop (between 1880 and 1890) and it was agreed to divide up the continent as a market for European manufactures and a source of raw materials, the principle was accepted that effective occupation or interest must be shown, to enable any Power to assert a valid claim to sovereignty. Some kind of government must be established, and to defray the expenses of government some mode of obtaining an immediate return from occupation had to be found. In the older British West African Colonies, which were yielding profits from trade, and in their hinterlands (now generally consolidated into the territory called Nigeria) where also trade was the principal object sought, this presented no great difficulty, since Customs duties or other revenues falling on trade yielded adequate funds. But in the more northerly parts of South Africa, in Nyasaland and East Africa, where our statesmen were in a hurry to peg out Imperial claims, there was no trade forthcoming that could pay the expenses of government.

The most conspicuous and characteristic feature of the early part of the scramble for Africa was the invasion of African territories by white adventurers aiming at obtaining concessions of all kinds from native chiefs, giving them monopolies of trading, seeking for minerals, etc. for trifling payments, and accepting the protection of the white man's flag. Some native states, such as Bechuanaland, and their

chiefs, resisted this process, but in Swaziland, Pondoland, and many other native territories the assets of the community were in danger of being eaten up. To protect native people against this process Protectorates were declared in some cases by the British Government. Bechuanaland and Basutoland remained practically self-governing native states under helpful guidance from British authority, but in the other new Protectorates the Foreign Office, which was then in control of such operations, adopted a more enterprising policy on behalf of British development, and the Colonial Office did the like in regard to the territories lying north of Bechuanaland and the Transvaal, which it was desired to secure for British expansion against the Boers. This policy deliberately chose the method of exploiting Africa by capitalist companies financed in London. In Central Africa and Nyasaland vast land concessions made to such companies, or usurped by them, were recognised. In Rhodesia the B.S.A. Chartered Company, which had obtained merely a mining concession from Lobengula, was allowed to destroy his power, to assert ownership of the lands of the whole country, and to sell them out in large blocks to syndicates and individuals, ignoring native rights. Farther north, in the East African Protectorate (now known as Kenya Colony) the Government adopted a somewhat similar policy of inviting white investors and settlers to take up large areas of land. In West Africa the Niger Company (formerly the Oil Rivers Company) was encouraged to consolidate a trading monopoly, but on this side of the continent the older Colonial Office tradition of respecting native land rights and native interests held its own, which it had been unable to do against Africander ideas in South Africa and the Foreign Office policy in East Africa. British Imperial policy at this time, acting through the B.S.A. Company, was a definite and deliberate policy of capitalist colonisation and exploitation thinly camouflaged by a professed consideration for native interests.

In South and East Africa the local conditions were different from those of West Africa and Nigeria to a degree which gave some justification for a different policy. These countries were comparatively scantily peopled, much of them was, or was believed to be, suitable for permanent

white colonisation, and there would have been room for white settlement without encroaching on the native user of land, or interfering in any way with the natives' livelihood. And at the same time it was arguable that white colonisation would benefit the natives economically and educationally.

The danger that white settlement might crowd the natives out of the best parts of their own country and lead to their reduction to the position of wage-slaves had led Sir Theophilus Shepstone in Natal to institute the system of native Reserves and to withstand the attempts of zealous missionaries to supersede native social customs and of the Government to destroy the native tribal authorities. A similar system was adopted in parts of the Cape Colony and of Zululand and has served to a considerable degree to protect natives, although it has been imperfectly carried out. The Colonial Office stipulated that the Chartered Company should respect native rights and customary tenures in land, and when they had failed to do this insisted on their establishing Reserves in Rhodesia in which only natives should be privileged to own land, but did not interfere with the Company's policy of destroying tribal government, exacting rents from resident natives, and putting pressure by taxation upon them to work for white employers.

Meanwhile the development of the gold and diamond industry in the Transvaal had profoundly affected the industrial relations between white and black. The Boers had never admitted the human parity of black races and white. They regarded the former as of an inferior order of creation, and treated them as incapable of civil rights. They were excluded, like the negroes of the United States, both by social customs and by legislation from mixing on equal terms with the whites. The growth of Johannesburg and the mining districts, which became the most important centre of settlement in South Africa, greatly reinforced this spirit of discrimination. It attracted large numbers of wholly uncivilised native workers, who were more and more subjected to exclusion from any part of the life of the white community except that of unskilled workers. They were confined in compounds, they were kept subject to rigorous pass laws, and the tendency to regard it as reasonable to treat natives as beings who have no rights at

all was enhanced, and its enhancement reacted on the whole of South Africa: even in the Cape Colony and Natal, where such discrimination was contrary to the constitutional basis of the community and to the promises made to natives in the name of the British Crown.

Further, the development of the mining industry attracted to South Africa British and other European miners and artisans. This class, as time progressed, found itself in danger from competition by black workers who could accept lower wages; and the Trade Unions not being sufficiently powerful to control the conditions of all skilled and semi-skilled industries, and not being in a position to establish standards of wages and conditions of employment by legislation, came to adopt a view of the native and his rights practically similar to that of the Boer and to co-operate with the Dutch African party in an endeavour deliberately to exclude him from the privileges of an industrial civilisation which rested fundamentally on the work of his bone and sinew.

Since the War the quality of the white wage-earning class employed in mining industries has considerably changed. It now contains a majority element of Boer "poor whites" and many alien immigrants from Europe. Both in the mining districts and in Natal and in some degree farther south, this class of poor white worker has greatly increased in numbers; and being predominantly averse to British ideas they have associated themselves energetically with the South African Nationalist party in jealousy of British influence and of British traditions of dealing with native races as exemplified in Cape Colony. They have adopted wholeheartedly the policy of repression of the natives inherent in the principles of the Boer Republics and the anti-Asiatic policy advocated on behalf of white shopkeepers and some classes of artisans against Indians. The Indian Government has been strong enough to secure some fairness of dealing for Indians, but the South African native has only the older traditions of the Cape Colony to help him against this degradation of public policy.

The industrialisation of parts of South Africa, co-operating with the white farmers' and speculators' land-hunger, and the theory of inequality, combined with racial prejudice,

and on the other hand the desire of friends of the native to afford him some protection and to save his social life from entire destruction, have worked together to popularise what is now the professed native policy of the Government of South Africa, namely, residential "segregation," industrial discrimination, and political disfranchisement of the native.

Farther north, in Rhodesia and on the Eastern side of Africa, the situation has not yet been complicated by the industrial development. In Rhodesia and in East Africa there was protracted obstruction on the part of European local interests against the establishment of native reserves, in order that the white man might have full opportunity to pick out all the best of the country and to reduce the natives to the position of a mere proletariat affording labour supply. This attitude was, of course, never officially accepted on behalf of the British Government, which cherished a desire, however ineffectual, to protect native interests, but it operated very effectively in practice, both in Rhodesia and Kenya, to delay for a great many years the marking out of reserves; and when the policy was being put into operation the advocates of white settlement outspokenly urged the restriction of such reserves to the smallest possible area, in order that their labour supply might be maintained. Lord Delamere, the most successful and influential of Kenya land speculators and "developing" settlers, protested to the Commission on Native Reserves that "if the policy was to be continued that every native was to be a landowner of a sufficient area on which to establish himself, then the question of obtaining a sufficient labour supply would never be settled." In Kenya Colony, though not in Rhodesia, the policy was actually formulated of trying to force the natives to come out of the reserves, to work for white men, by imposing on them the alternative obligation of having to work a certain period in each year for the Government. With this episode I shall deal fully hereafter.[1] Many white settlers considered that they had a right to expect this kind of help from the Government. They had been invited by official authority to come out and settle, and they had bought land from the Government, or from the concessionnaires of the Government, on the assurance that it was a

[1] See Chapter XX.

suitable country for white men and that they could found homes and earn an income there. They found that it was neither customary nor possible for Europeans to do their own work, and that the native labour supply was deficient. The East African Commission,[1] above referred to, expressed the judgment that in Kenya more land has been granted to Europeans than can be developed by the existing labour supply, even if all the able-bodied natives available without starvation to their own people were disposed to work. Kenya constitutes what is probably the worst case of over-colonisation by white settlers, promoted by the policy of encouraging capitalist land speculation and European immigration financed in this country. The position has so far been much less serious in Rhodesia, where more of the land has been taken up by farmers whose enterprises of cattle-raising demand less intensive cultivation than those of coffee and cotton, which have tempted settlers in Kenya. But already in Rhodesia, too, the cultivation of tobacco and similarly exacting crops is causing labour shortage: and the employment of young children in agriculture is rapidly developing under legislative encouragement.

In all these territories, constant pressure is put upon the native to work for the white man, either through the method of depriving him of his land or of imposing on him the hut- or poll-tax, for which it is hardly ever pretended that he gets an administrative equivalent, but which he can only earn by working for wages for several months at least in the year, unless he is the fortunate proprietor of cattle or a member of a tribe so endowed (as are the Masai), which will pay his tax for him.

The now professed policy of the Union Government of South Africa is to establish segregation between the races by confining the ownership and occupation of the land for each race to separate areas.

But they have not been able and are not likely to be able to carry it out. The farmers and land syndicates of the Northern provinces are not prepared to give up any land for native settlement. They have acquired and intend to retain for themselves by far the greater portion and all

[1] See Report, Cmd. 2387, 1925.

the best of the land available, and the extension of native reserves would impair their supply of labour. The Economic and Wages Commission (1925–1926) declared that

> "The contact of the natives and the European has lasted too long, and their economic co-ordination is too intimate and well established for the native to be excluded from the European areas and the European industry. The provision of adequate native reserves has been delayed too long for it to be possible for the present native population of the Union to live without dependence on outside employment, and *it was for too long the policy of the Union to drive the native by taxation and other devices to work for Europeans for it to be possible now to exclude him from the field of employment he is occupying.*"

A policy of segregation in regard to the ownership and occupation of territory may still be practicable in such territories as Southern and Northern Rhodesia, Tanganyika, and parts of Kenya. In these territories, where there are large areas of land practically unoccupied and unused, it would be extravagant to propound that white men ought not to be allowed to settle. If they are able to settle, maintain themselves, and build up a society in such countries there is no justification for holding that they should be excluded in the supposed interests of a comparatively small population of native tribes, sometimes themselves also recent immigrants, who now occupy parts of them. Where it is impossible for white men to establish genuine white communities and where the land is no more than sufficient for the future needs of the natives within a reasonably foreseeable period, the case is different. There, as in West Africa and Nigeria, the true function of the white man in pursuit of his own interests is to facilitate trade and native production by good administration and agricultural and economic education. This policy, it is fair to say, has been the prevailing policy of the Colonial Office in West Africa, and it has had very good results. It is declaredly also a great part at least of the policy of British administration in East Africa; but on all the eastern side of the Continent and in South Africa its

whole-hearted adoption has been prejudiced, even where it has not been entirely excluded, by the alternative theory of Third Period colonisation, namely, that a new form of civilisation can be evolved founded upon the ownership of estates by white men and their establishment as a dominant class in those districts where they can maintain families, although they cannot themselves do the work, and that the labour shall be supplied by the natives, including children, under indenture. This policy is inherently, and has been proved in practice effectively, antagonistic to policy of the West African type. It may be possible to conceive of a wholesome and prosperous society being evolved in such a mixed community, but there are certain indispensable conditions for such evolution. First of all, there must be available for the natives in the present, and reserved for their future needs, fully sufficient land of good quality to dispense them from any compulsion to work for white employers if they prefer to work for themselves on their own lands. Secondly, their own tribal social institutions must be allowed to persist, subject to the repression of cruel and anti-social practices, such as slavery and the smelling out of witches. There are many practices sanctioned by native custom which may reasonably be repressed or even forbidden; but it should be a general rule that a native custom should at any rate be assumed to have good reasons in its favour, not to be arbitrarily overruled on the ground that it is contrary to the ideas of Christianity or European civilisation and morals. In order to maintain the continuity and advantages of tribal institutions the authority of the chiefs must be maintained and must be left to rest upon established customs: that is to say, chiefs must not be arbitrarily deposed or imposed. The authority of the chief is traditional and religious, and cannot be effectually transferred to paid nominees or headmen selected at the convenience of European invaders.

On the other hand, provided that land and continuity of their own social and tribal institutions are ensured to the natives, white settlement, not interfering with these, giving natives opportunities of earning wages when it suits them to do so, and of obtaining education and training in the industrial arts and economic practices of European civilisa-

tion, is an advantage to Africans. The principal root of difficulty in Kenya has been first of all the over-capitalisation of the country. Too many white men have gone there under the impression that they could make money there by planting management ; and the construction of public works and railways for the benefit of the white settlers has been pressed forward too feverishly. Various modes of pressure, such as those already referred to, have been imposed on the natives, most crudely on the unvarnished pretext that they are idle and ought to be made to work for the white man; or on the plea that the Government of the Colony is for their benefit, and that unless they so work it cannot be carried on; and, finally, on the plea that working for white men is the best education that they can have. It is imperative that this demand should be relaxed and that no similar demands should be pressed anywhere else in Africa.

CHAPTER XIII

COLOURED LABOUR IN SOUTH AFRICA

I

In the first edition of this book I quoted largely from that important Report of the South African Native Affairs Commission of 1905, which had then newly appeared. Reading that Report again in the light of acquaintance with contemporary conditions I find it almost equally useful and instructive to-day as an authority for my subject. My quotations will be lengthy: but the whole of them is full of significance as the expression of the commonly current views of men of respected position in South African public affairs with regard to native land and labour questions. Where there have been partial changes in public opinion the character of those changes, and the explanations of them, are themselves significantly instructive. It will be recognised that two schools of opinion were represented in the Commission, one more liberal than the other in its attitude towards native rights. In their extremes they correspond to opposed opinions in this regard prevailing in South Africa to-day. Owing to the increased and increasing political weight of the Boer electorates of the Northern Provinces and of those elsewhere who associate themselves with what is known as the Nationalist Party, especially during the political coalition of the White Labour Party with these, the more oppressive attitude in Native Policy has been recently in the ascendant, or at least has had more effective political backing, than it had in 1905. I have dealt somewhat fully with the immediate aspects of controversies as to native labour and land in another recent book, *The Anatomy of African Misery*, and I desire to avoid repetition. The Report of the Commission of

1905 is of living interest and importance also because its recommendations, especially its pronouncement in favour of "segregation," became, in 1913, the basis of General Botha's native land legislation, and have influenced and continue to influence other proposals of native policy. For reasons explained in *The Anatomy of African Misery*, Botha's land legislation remained abortive, whilst the difficulties not only in regard to native land but also in the relations between white capital and coloured labour and between white and native wage-workers, have continuously become more complex and difficult. General Hertzog's recent programme of native legislation, partly enacted and partly still incomplete, has constituted another attempt to deal with these problems, and the 1905 Report remains most enlightening as to the fundamental factors of human attitude out of which the difficulties to be dealt with arise.

With regard to the industrial habits and temperament of the native people the Commissioners express their conclusions as follows (the italics are mine):—

> "§ 372. The natives *have had access to the land* on terms which have enabled them to regard *work for wages* as a mere supplement to their means, and not as it is regarded in the older communities, namely, as the urgent condition under which the majority of mankind earn their bread."

I invite attention to the phraseology of this paragraph. It comes very naturally to anyone bred among English conditions and economic assumptions to think, as a matter of course, about land as a strict monopoly to which the workers in an intelligently ordered civilisation are allowed "to have access on terms," namely, as labourers for its owner or farmer, or as interlopers frowned on by notice boards threatening trespassers with prosecution. The native African, however, has his home on the land and habitually employs himself on it to produce his own food, deeming it as natural to do so as it is for the wild animals of the country. One might as appropriately talk of the game of South Africa as "having access to land." That is how the native lives, as a cow feeds, and his customs of

work are adapted to the requirements of his agricultural and pastoral systems.

> "§ 373. *The theory that the South African natives are hopelessly indolent may be dismissed as not being in accordance with the facts.* Even the simple wants of the native population cannot be supplied without some degree of exertion. The population of 4,652,662 has to derive its sustenance from a soil which is not everywhere fertile, and the native agriculturist has to contend with the same drawbacks of drought and pestilence that beset the European farmer. The labour of tilling the soil, weeding and reaping, is shared, but is by no means exclusively performed, by the native women; and *the representation of the native as living at his own village a lazy, luxurious life, supported by his wife or wives, is misleading.*"

(We have seen already what natives of East Africa themselves say on this point, and what is said of them to the same effect.)

> "§ 374. The main reasons for the existence of *labour difficulties* may be summarised as follows:—
>
> "The native population have always been pastoral and agricultural.
>
> "The rapid increase of South African *labour requirements*, particularly during the last quarter of a century, *has found them* to a great extent unprepared to meet the new conditions which surround them.
>
> "The normal condition of native life is that of a small cultivator and herdsman, and the circumstances of their history have never developed among them a class accustomed to and dependent upon *continuous daily labour.*
>
> "The inexpensiveness of their living, the limited nature of their wants, and the comparative absence of incentive to labour.
>
> "The terms on which they occupy the land."

The natives have been "found" (significant word) unprepared to a great extent to meet the new conditions which

surround them, namely, the rapid increase of South African labour requirements—meaning, the requirement of Europeans that black South Africans should labour for them in the mines.

> "§ 375. Except in the case of farm labour and the like, which is specially suited to the native, it must not be forgotten that what is known as paid labour generally, means to the native, as a rule, absence from home and family, and in some employments irksome and often hard and dangerous work, and the abandonment of the ease, comforts, and pleasures of native village life. As further discouragements there have been breaches of agreements by contractors, misrepresentations by labour agents and touts, and occasional harsh treatment, which have tended to shake the confidence of the native. The rate of wages, nominally high, has to be considered in relation to the purchasing power of money at present South African prices, and it must be remembered that the native has, as a rule, to pay top prices for his purchases."

The conviction that the supply of "labour" in South Africa was desperately deficient is one with which we were in 1905 very familiar. The mines were then clamouring for the importation of indentured Chinese coolies. Let me summarise the conclusions of this Commission upon that subject. (Allowing for increases of the figures all round the balance of the situation is not very different to-day: only it is worse for the native.) They estimated that in British South Africa, including the Cape Colony, Natal, the Transvaal, with Swaziland, the Orange River Colony, and Southern Rhodesia, Basutoland, and the Bechuanaland Protectorate, there were about 900,000 able-bodied possible workers, of whom from 450,000 to 475,000 might be held to be always at work, or available for work. The units of this total oscillated between their homes and outside labour, but the approximate total was constant. The Commissioners here drop into the familiar habit characteristic of those social philosophers who speak from the employing class, and which may well be mystifying to the reader who takes words in their simple senses, of using the term "work"

or "labour" as signifying only paid work at wages for an employer. They must not, however, be understood as meaning that half the adult native male population of South Africa are continuously idle, for they have themselves maintained the contrary; what they mean is that only about half that population can by any means be detached from its own employments to work for white employers. This seems a fairly high proportion, and the figures would indicate that the average South African native is willing or finds it necessary to work *for wages* a good many more days in the year than the average West Indian negro. Moreover, he will do what the West Indian (remembering slavery) can never be induced to do—he will enter into a contract for labour under legal penalties for longer or shorter spells. But such spells will be intermittent, from causes similar to those that make fitful the West Indian labour supply. The average period for which a man will consent to remain away from his home working at wages is from three to six months in mines and other industries, and somewhat longer in agricultural labour. The times at which he will be available for such labour will depend upon the requirements of his home life, and upon the counter-attractions which may be acting upon him at any particular season. After the South African War he was flush of money, and, like the West Indian negro in such circumstances, did not consider it worth his while to work at all at pre-war wages. This fitfulness of the native labour supply has operated as one of the strongest incentives in South Africa, as it did also in the West Indies, to a demand for *imported* indentured labour, not accessible to these local distractions, as essential for the continuous exploitation of undertakings conducted with expensive installations of machinery where work has to be begun at the word of command and carried on steadily throughout the whole year. The higher cost of such immigrant labour—and it seems to be more costly in South Africa, as it certainly is in the West Indies, judged by the standard daily wage expenditure—is more than compensated by the avoidance of waste in interest and capital charges.

The supply of available wage-labourers being, as estimated, about 475,000, the Commissioners (writing in

January 1905) estimated the demand for labourers for all employers' purposes in British South Africa as about 782,000, showing a "shortage" of more than 300,000. The bulk of this "shortage" was said to be in the Transvaal, *i.e.* in the mines, where the demand was stated at 374,000, the supply as 90,695—a deficiency of more than 280,000. In Natal, an agricultural colony, where the white population (chiefly farmers) are fewer in proportion to the natives than in the Transvaal, the supply was shown as exceeding the demand by about 26,500.

Consideration of what constitutes the alleged disparity between the demand for and the supply of hired labour in South Africa yields conclusions which must affect our whole judgment of the problems involved. The demand for labour referred to is not a need of the community as an organic self-contained society. It is not a scarcity of power for the maintenance of the local life and of an adequate degree of local civilisation. The power for these purposes is abundantly there, if only it were made applicable by such methods as I describe in Chapter XXVI. It is for the most part simply a demand on the part of foreign capital for muscular labour power with which to extract wealth from the mineral resources of the soil for the profit of European recipients. Allowing that the production of gold (though itself useless for any vital human purpose and having merely, through historical accident, a conventional value as the selected token and basis of credit) may serve to purchase increase of command of wealth and well-being for a country endowed with gold-mines, it is the fact that the measure of the riches locally distributed by this industry in South Africa is only the amount of the wages and salaries of the labour that it brings into employment on the spot. The value of the machinery employed, and practically the whole of the surplus value of the product after payment of these salaries and wages, are absorbed in Europe. If the local community owned the mines, a very much smaller employment of labour force on the richer mines would produce, for that local community as a whole, the same amount of wealth for local consumption. The excessive demand for labour, which causes a deficiency to be felt in the supply, is due to the call for the production of the vast total of

value which is exported and consumed out of the country. It is essentially and characteristically an exploiting and capitalist demand. It is quite true that the situation resulting from this demand creates a sensible shortage of labour for the common needs of the country in the production of food in agriculture, the services of trade, and in the ordinary social and domestic employments; but apart from the strictly external demand for the means of producing dividends, the supply for these local purposes would be superabundant and the country richer. The draft of labour [1] is destroying the productivity of native agriculture and the rural natives are getting poorer. The demand is altogether in its general character a demand that the native shall work for a foreign employer, even at the cost of diminishing his work for his own native society. It is, in fact, directly antagonistic to the vitality of his own social institutions. And in the opinion, then recently expressed, of Sir Godfrey Lagden, than whom few more experienced or perspicuous authorities could be named, the competition for his services and the higher wages offered were breeding in him even at that time an attitude towards the white man very dangerous to the South African equilibrium. That attitude has now (1928) been aggravated by subsequent history. Such a development might possibly be considered to be desirable from the natives' point of view as conceived by extremists. It is, at any rate, a matter for the European to take account of if he wishes to maintain his position in the country.

Notice, further, that the extent of this demand and the corresponding deficiency of labour supply are only limited by the limitations of the country's resources conceivably available for exploitation by white capital. It was stated that there was a shortage of supply in the Transvaal amounting to 284,000. That estimate was arrived at by calculating how many men the mines of the Witwatersrand and the mineral industries of the Colony could employ *if they were developed into full working on the basis of their then capitalisation.* Now, if prospectors discover a fresh gold-field of equal extent with the Rand, or if, as has happened since

[1] See evidence given before the Economic and Wages Commission, 1925, and the Select Committee of the Assembly (1927) on Native Affairs Bills.

then, there are new discoveries of platinum or other mineral wealth, to say nothing of planting enterprise, the "demand" for labour and the "shortage" of it increase; and the distressful plight of the labour-starved European is proportionately aggravated. On the other hand, if the owners of South African mines had deemed it advisable only to exploit for the present, say, one-third of their properties, the labour supply available under the incentives then operating would have about sufficed, and this agonising labour problem would not have existed.

The "depression and malaise" of which we have heard from time to time as afflicting Johannesburg is wholly an imported suffering. A great proportion of it is not felt there at all; it is felt by investors in England, disappointed of returns on their shares, who localise and impute their own distress to the scene whence it originates. Where their treasure is there is their heart also. And so far as there is local distress, it is chiefly the distress of Europeans excluded from opportunity of partaking in the processes of exploitation.

It appears, in fact, that the "labour problem" in South Africa is one created principally by the particular demand of the white employers, or would-be employers, and white investors and immigrants seeking and disappointed of fortune, and it is notable that the effect of the situation upon the temper of the white towards the native and upon his views of social expediency in regard to the administrative control of the latter is precisely the same in South Africa as it has been in the West Indies. It creates an irritation of temper and censoriousness of judgment on the part of the white towards the black. He complains that the black is idle, and it calls for a grave pronouncement by a Commission such as that I have quoted to set forth the plain common sense of the matter. The censure by the white of the black man's idleness is even more preposterous in South Africa than it is in the West Indies, because in South Africa there is a stronger determination to assert and maintain the colour-line, and to prescribe that manual labour is to be for the black and the black for manual labour, whilst the white is to be his captain and director. All the heavy manual work that has been done has been done by native labour: the agriculture, the mining, the road and railway

making. It is the white man that wants to get this work done for him. "We may conclude," writes Mr D. Kidd, in the excellent but by no means over-favourable study he gives of this question in the book I have mentioned above, "that while the Kaffir differs from Europeans in his ideas as to what constitutes profitable labour, and is much better off in relative riches compared with Europeans, who cannot rest content with what the Kaffir considers ample comfort, he is not utterly lazy. The moment there is what he considers an adequate inducement to work, he rouses himself and begins!" Which is precisely what is true also of the West Indian and West African negro. In my experience when a white man denounces the laziness of the black, in nine cases out of ten it is the man who has desired to employ him, and has found him independent or evasive, or merely a tourist or visitor who has assimilated impressions fed to him by such hosts.

Following this censoriousness and anxiety for the moralisation of the native, we have seen arising in South Africa, as in the United States, and later very notably in Kenya, the theory that the native must be educated and civilised by teaching him to labour and to want. Great numbers of those who have ceased to abuse the native for idleness quite sincerely and good-heartedly hold this theory. It is a theory that coincides most providentially with the purposes for which the white man is there, viz. to get things dug up or grown which the native does not want to dig for or grow. Hence such convictions as that a higher taxation of the native is necessary and that such taxation can best be imposed by means of a poll-tax, or hut-tax, with additional taxation for every wife the native keeps in excess of the first; and with the singular and significant exemption that farm-servants in *bona fide* and continuous employment should be free from the tax. It is impossible to dissociate recommendations of this character from the pressure of the imported demand of the white man that the native shall come and work for wages for his profit.

The inclination to favour the policy of forcing the native to work, by direct taxation, or restricting the area of land which he may occupy, either as member of a tribe, on a location, or as an individual, in fee simple, is much

more widely diffused than expressed. It is easy to discern its influence even in parts of the Report of the Native Affairs' Commission, although the majority of the Commissioners were clearly opposed to it. Some of the paragraphs in which their conclusions are summed up appear to me to be worth quoting here:

> "§ 191. There is a manifest effort being made on the part of natives to-day to possess land, which is not counteracted by any reluctance on the part of European holders to dispose of it so long as the sellers are not themselves bound to live in proximity.
>
> "§ 192. If this process goes on, while at the same time restrictions exclude Europeans from purchasing within native areas, it is inevitable that at no very distant date the amount of land in native occupation will be *undesirably* extended. Native wages and earnings are greater than they used to be, their wants are few, and their necessary expenses small. They will buy land at prices above its otherwise market value, as their habits and *standard of living*[1] enable them to exist on land that it is impossible for Europeans to farm on a small scale. There will be many administrative and social difficulties created by the multiplication of a number of native units scattered throughout a white population and owning the land of the country equally with them. *Such a situation cannot fail to accentuate feelings of race prejudice and animosity, with unhappy results. It will be far more difficult to preserve the absolutely necessary political and social distinctions if the growth of a mixed rural population of landowners is not discouraged.*"

It will be noted that it is deemed undesirable that natives should be able to extend their occupation of land in proportion to their requirements and their means, and is argued that because the natives by living and working on the land themselves can get more out of it for their own purposes, of which the principal is the maintenance

[1] They can make as good an income out of it and a pleasanter life than that of a pre-War English agricultural labourer. See Chapter XXVI.

of congenial life, than the European can for his by employing their labour upon it by slovenly farming, it is to be regarded as following that it is undesirable that natives should be allowed to acquire land. The argument may appear at first sight to be a little obscure; but on examination it becomes luminously significant. It is thought better that the labour of natives should be employed, less productively than it can be, for the purpose of enabling Europeans to make a profit out of it, than that natives should be allowed to use it profitably for themselves. This is truly a remarkable precept of political economy. It means that in proportion to the population a less amount of wealth is to be produced, in order that the employing class may the more profit. That is to say, that the native population are to be proportionately so much poorer per head than they need be in order that white employers may be wealthier. It is not often that Socialists are presented with such an honest and simple-minded argument in support of their criticisms of the working of the capitalist system. It is the argument which causes English farming to be regarded as a more admirable agricultural proposition than that of Switzerland.

In this section, too, there emerges the doctrine of segregation, with which also I have dealt very fully in *The Anatomy of African Misery*. Note the pessimistic fatalism of tone, in criticism of which I would refer to what I have written in Chapters V to VII and have quoted in Chapter VII.

> "§ 193. The Commission has arrived almost unanimously at the conclusion that it is necessary to safeguard what are conceived to be the interests of the Europeans of this country, but that in doing so *the door should not be entirely closed* to *deserving* and *progressive* individuals among the natives acquiring land, and has resolved as follows:—
>
> "That certain restrictions upon the purchase of land by natives are necessary, and recommends
>
> "1. That purchase by natives should in future be limited to certain areas to be defined by legislative enactment.
>
> "2. That purchase of land which may lead to tribal,

communal, or collective possession or occupation by natives should not be permitted."

The position of the Commissioners, speaking with a division of voices, in this paragraph, is truly unhappy. They are almost persuaded that segregation is necessary in the interests of the Europeans of the country. The more liberal section are prepared to agree to this with regard to the uncivilised tribal native. But it is still repugnant to them that "deserving and progressive individuals among the natives" should not be able to better themselves, and they consequently recommend the compromise proposed in the paragraph. Unfortunately, twenty years later the operations of capitalist industry in South Africa have set up such a competition between the white proletariat which it has created and the black that it is precisely those deserving and progressive individuals amongst the natives against whom General Hertzog has thought it necessary to legislate by the Colour-Bar Law, excluding them from skilled occupations. Further, the two principles recommended in this paragraph, after having been embodied in General Botha's legislation, were found impracticable, because the white landowners would not make the necessary concessions, and General Hertzog's Land Bill departs from both of them.

"§ 148. Col. Stanford dissented from the view of the majority on the question of restricting to certain areas only the right of the individual native to purchase land. He holds that the acquisition by the more advanced natives of vested individual interests in the land is a powerful incentive to loyalty, and that only in the event of its leading to the extension of the tribal system beyond the reserves or locations would the right of native purchase be contrary to the best interests of both races. In his opinion sufficient cause has not been shown for the curtailment of privileges enjoyed for many years in the British Colonies. No depopulation of any area or district in respect of European occupiers has been proved; and he foresees that in the course of time, as the natives in their locations advance in civilisation and receive full rights to individual holdings, the barriers now quite rightly placed

in the way of their selling such holdings will be removed, and transactions in land proceed as freely in the reserves as is now the case elsewhere. Urban areas may be protected against undesirable native occupation, as is done against the undesirable occupation of Europeans, by regulations.

"The contention that the safety of the European races must be guarded by such restrictions as have been under discussion he does not hold to be sound. The Church, professions, commerce, trade, and labour are open to the ambition and energy of the natives, and with so many avenues open to their advance the danger of their swamping the Europeans, if a real one, is not avoided by denying them the right individually to buy land.

"He can see no decadence of the vigour, the enterprise, and the courage which, since the occupation of the Cape Peninsula by the early Dutch settlers, have resulted in the extension of European control and occupation to the limits now reached. Moreover, artificial restriction of the purchase of land, when attempted in the late Dutch Republics, resulted in the evasion of the law by various forms of contract whereby native occupation of farms was effected, while at the same time advantage was taken of the opportunities thus afforded of fraudulent practices on the part of Europeans employed as agents or so-called trustees.

"The proposed areas are not recommended for demarcation in existing reserves or locations. Therefore, in the older British Colonies and in the Orange River Colony, if demarcated at all, *they must affect present European occupation.*"

(The fact that they would have done so was the cause of the failure of Botha's law.)

"If, on the other hand, the design be to allow purchase by natives in localities regarded as unsuitable for Europeans, sight is lost of the fact that usually the native who desires to become a landed proprietor belongs to the civilised class and such localities offer to him no attraction.

"Europeans are more and more entering upon occupation of land regarded as set aside for natives. Missionaries, traders, and others are permitted to establish themselves and carry on the duties or work of their respective callings. Townships sprang up at the various seats of magistracy, and census returns clearly show that the influx is steadily increasing in volume. It is thus demonstrated that the idea of separate occupation of land by natives, even in their own reserves, is not maintained at the present time, nor can it be in the future.

"The Commission has no reliable data to go upon in making any comparison of the relative strength of these two streams: Europeans into native reserves as owners of land or occupiers under Government sanction leading up to title, and *vice versa*, natives out of their reserves into surveyed parts as owners. From his own observation, so far as it goes, Col. Stanford's opinion is that the former is the greater."

Colonel Stanford in this dissenting note figures as one of those ill-conditioned people who talk as if one could deal with questions of relations between white and black on a basis of concrete conditions and obvious common sense, and who imagine that given certain causes certain normal results will ensue and will not be averted because those causes happen to act between human beings with different coloured skins: which is precisely what is proved by the observation of the effects of similar causes as I have reviewed them in the West Indies. He makes a stand, however, against the idea of the tribal system being allowed to extend beyond the Reserves or locations. And it may be noted that the Government of Southern Rhodesia, in dealing with the question of segregation in 1927 on the Report of the Southern Rhodesia Lands Commission, followed his view and decided not to permit tribal purchase in any of the new areas assigned for native ownership under the scheme they adopted. General Hertzog, on the other hand, in his Native Land Bill, still under consideration as I write this, proposes to allow tribal purchase only. The fact is that hardly any native working as an individual can earn enough money

to buy land. The chiefs can buy out of tribal funds, and as they can no longer go to war with their neighbours to extend their territory or find any useful vacant land that is not being held by white men, they must either buy as chiefs more land for their people or have their people starve and their tribes break up. It has been urged by witnesses before the Select Committee on General Hertzog's Bills that facilities ought to be given for natives to buy not only individually or through their chiefs, but in associations other than tribal, on the co-operative credit of which land banks might assist in finding the money for purchase.

"§ 199. The representatives of the Colony of Natal dissent from the recommendation that the purchase of land by natives should in future be limited to certain areas to be defined by legislative enactment, and they give the following reasons:—

"1. That natives in the Cape Colony, Natal, and Rhodesia can, like all other persons, purchase and hold land in their own right at the present time, excepting in cases where Government or any other owner of land for special reasons may place a contrary condition on public or other lands when put up for sale.

"2. That the resolution limits and restricts the sale of land by Europeans and races other than natives.

"3. That the resolution is in conflict with the spirit of other recommendations of the Commission, which have for their object the encouragement of individual tenure.

"4. That Asiatics and other coloured races not of African descent may purchase land anywhere, whereas by this resolution the natives, who are the aborigines of the country, will be excluded from this privilege except in limited areas[1] *selected, probably, for their unhealthiness and unsuitability for irrigation and cultivation and other kindred reasons.*

"5. That the resolution affects and limits the right of free trade possessed by every other subject of the British Empire, a right which is enjoyed by the natives of South Africa in every other sphere of business.

"6. That the resolution recommends a demarcation

[1] See the last sentence of this Chapter, p. 155.

based practically on racial or colour lines unaccompanied by any other considerations such as the attainment by natives of material and social progress, evolution and advancement from native law, customs and usages, and polygamy, and the introduction of better modes of living and cultivation stimulated by the sense of security and proprietorship.

"They are of opinion that the determining factors in the ownership of land by natives should be:

"(*a*) The degree of civilisation attained.

"(*b*) Devolution and inheritance under the ordinary colonial law applicable to Europeans, and not under native law.

"(*c*) The abandonment of polygamy.

"Subject to this standard being attained, they are in favour of unrestricted right and opportunity of purchase of land by natives."

It will be observed that in 1905 the representatives of the Colony of Natal dissented from the policy of segregation. That policy has now been professedly adopted by the Government of Rhodesia, and the right of individual purchase by natives has been restricted to certain areas. Further, the principle of the segregation of ownership is half-heartedly embodied in General Hertzog's Bills. In clauses (5) and (6) of this paragraph it is interesting to recognise that the representatives of the Colony of Natal claim the maintenance of the right of free trade at that time enjoyed by the natives of South Africa in every other sphere of business and protest against a demarcation based on racial or colour lines. These sentiments are now apparently out of date in South Africa, since the relics of the traditions they represent have been politically swamped by the predominance of the Nationalist Party in coalition with the white Labour Party.

"§ 207. The Commission is of opinion and recommends:

"1. That the time has arrived when the lands dedicated and set apart, or to be dedicated and set apart, as locations, reserves, or otherwise, should be defined,

delimited, and reserved for the natives by legislative enactment.

"2. That this should be done with a view to finality in the provision of land for the native population, and that thereafter no more land should be reserved for native occupation.

"§ 378. The supply of labour available from local sources is capable of being increased, and the Commission has given attention to suggestions as to how this is to be done. Any recommendation as to higher wages is quite out of place. In the first place, any departure from the principle that the rate of wages must be a matter of free contract between employer and employee is unsound, nor is any relief from present difficulties to be found in such a measure. To raise the rate of wages in one locality might have the effect of attracting labour to that particular quarter at the expense of other industries, but that would not alter the general situation. Further, it has been stated, and the Commission feels that there is a measure of truth in the suggestion, that while increased wages might have the effect of tempting a larger number of labourers into the market, on the other hand, such increased gains *would enable them to remain for a longer period at their own homes.*

"§ 379. The Commission, therefore, makes no recommendation on the subject of the rate of native wages."

The South African Union Legislature has not accepted the view that any departure from the principle that the rate of wages must be a matter of free contract between employer and employed must be unsound. On the contrary, they have since 1905 enacted a very soundly conceived body of legislation to enable the regulation of the wages of white labour, and in particular the establishment by law of a minimum wage. It is true that these enactments have hitherto in practice affected the relations only between white capital and white labour, but it is at the time when I write proposed to extend the provisions of the Wages Regulation Law to coloured people and native men. The

effect of this would be to take natives out of the sphere of free contract with their employers and to bring them within the purview of the law, so that the provisions of the Colour-Bar Law may become applicable to them. This, it is expected, will diminish their competition with white workers. In so far as this sinister effect is not realised—that is to say, if the Government abstains from using its powers of applying the Colour-Bar Law to some industries—the policy is quite a sound one and may be a first step towards bringing native labour into organised association with the white labour Unions. That, however, is not its intended purpose. It is on the lines recommended in the Report of the Economic Wages Commission of 1925–1926, which were made before the Colour-Bar Law was passed, and which emphatically denounced the policy of that measure and expressed the hope that it would not be adopted.

I have thought it sufficient to italicise the last sentence of the 378th paragraph. Discursive comment seems hardly necessary. But it is deserving of notice that the Commission, which in § 192 had insisted on the desirability of segregation, should here take it for granted that it must be deemed undesirable that natives capable of working for white men should remain in their own homes.

But it is really time that South African publicists should give up talking about segregation, a visionary ideal which no one in contact with the facts of the situation seriously pretends to contemplate: for it is now clear and officially recognised that territorial segregation is not practicable, since the land will not be conceded for it, whilst industrial segregation is not desired, since the native is everywhere in demand as a labourer.

> "§ 380. Any measure of compulsion is to be deprecated, not only as unjust, but as economically unsound. Native evidence in Natal was to the effect that *the form of compulsory service obtaining there* is intensely distasteful to the native people concerned. *The labour is paid for at less than the prevailing rate*, thus penalising the men employed, who, by going out to the ordinary employments open to unskilled labourers,

could earn higher wages. Some of the most responsible and important witnesses in Natal expressed in evidence before the Commission their disapproval of this form of compulsory labour."

Since the date of this Report the Natal Government has abolished this *corvée*, but, as has been mentioned and will be further set forth, it is still maintained and cherished elsewhere in British possessions, under the Colonial Office, especially Kenya.

"§ 381. Indirect compulsion in the form of a labour tax, with a remission to workers, has been recommended, but the suggestion appears to the Commission to be open to the same objections as apply to direct compulsion: in addition to which, any measure of taxation of this kind to be really effective would have to be so high as to be impossible of application. Every native community includes in its number the old, the infirm, and those whom, by virtue of other pursuits, or by reason of family circumstances, it would be very unjust to force from their homes into the labour market or to heavily tax with a view to doing so. But the Commission considers that in the interests of the State, of the development of the great natural resources of the country, and of the natives themselves, it would not only be legitimate but wise and just to keep in view in all legislative and administrative measures the creation of a condition of things which at least will not perpetuate or aggravate the existing labour difficulty. It cannot but be an advantage to the natives to be induced without compulsion to become more industrious. Economic pressure and the struggle for existence will be felt by many of them at no very distant date, and an industrious people will be better fitted for such conditions—which are even now arising. The formative influences which labour and industry will bring to bear on the character of the native himself will be most valuable.

"§ 383. The following are the recommendations made with a view to stimulate industry among the natives:—

"The *checking* of the practice of *squatting*, by refusal to license all but necessary or desirable private locations, and the imposition of a tax on such locations as may be authorised, based on the number of able-bodied natives domiciled thereon.

"The imposition of a *rent* on natives *living on Crown* lands as distinct from recognised reserves or locations, such rent to be based upon the value of such land and to be regularly and punctually collected.

"The enforcement of *laws against vagrancy* in municipal areas and native labour locations, whereby idle persons should be expelled.

"The encouragement of a higher standard among natives by *support given to education* with a view to increase their efficiency *and wants*.

"The encouragement of *industrial and manual training* in schools.

"*The protection of the native worker in his health, his comfort, his safety, and his interests* by provision for his accommodation and transport *when travelling by rail or road to and from his work*.[1]

"The enactment of regulations which will so far as possible secure that while at the larger labour centres his food, his housing, his sanitation, and his medical treatment should be satisfactory. In this respect the Commission recognises that very much has already been done at Cape Town, Kimberley, Johannesburg, and other centres.

"The abolition of all taxes or charges upon passes when travelling.

"§ 386. Messrs Krogh, Hamilton, Thompson, and de la Harpe desire to add to the foregoing list of recommendations, made with a view to stimulate industry among the natives, the following:—

"*The imposition of an annual rent on location land based on the producing value.*

[1] To wit—an employer's work, but not at other times, when at his own work.

"The substitution of individual for communal tenure, with the right of sale between native and native.

"Close attention to the enumeration of huts liable to tax and the punctual collection of the tax thereon.

"§ 410. The majority of the Commission are opposed to the idea of rent being charged to natives on locations and reserves. The resolutions recommend a change wherever the present tax is less than the minimum named therein, *e.g.* in the Cape Colony, Natal, and the Bechuanaland Protectorate; but a minority of the Commission urge that above and beyond this change in detail there is the greater question of whether the natives should be required, or not, to pay rent for the land they occupy. The Commission has affirmed the principle that rent should be paid in the case of *squatters on Crown lands*, and in the case of the natives holding under individual tenure what is now location or reserve land.

"§ 411. In the opinion of the minority this principle is sound, and should be extended wherever possible *to all land* in *use or occupation of natives*, such as native locations or reserves, together with the further principle that the rent should be based on the producing value of the land.

"§ 412. The minority referred to does not consider that a rent charge by the State could be properly described as taxation, being a payment for value like any other rent. The subject is introduced here because of its collateral bearing upon the matter of taxation, and its direct bearing upon the question of whether the natives contribute adequately to the State for the benefits they receive from the State. Among these benefits, not the least is the peaceful use and occupation of large tracts of country, aggregating 141,100,800 acres, throughout South Africa *free of rent*.

"§ 413. The minority of the Commission believes that to do away with free land to the natives would be to strike at the root of much that is most un-

satisfactory in native life—tribalism, communal occupation of land, polygamy, inertness, the comparative unprogressiveness of the mass, *the absence* of *the desire for or incentive to agricultural or industrial paid labour*—and that, coupled with the right of purchase and sale of land among themselves, leading in time to larger individual holdings, the change would in a relatively short time reduce the number of natives tied to the locations and reserves, release a large number for work more valuable to themselves and to the country, and would immensely raise the manner of living and the habits of the natives remaining on the locations and reserves.

"§ 414. The minority recommends that hand in hand with the levying of rent on land and out of the greatly increased revenue which would thereby accrue, a liberal encouragement and endowment of schools, industrial training institutions, irrigation works, roads, railways, hospitals, and other schemes and works likely to raise the standard of native life and to increase their efficiency as economic units in the State should be given."

I invite special attention to the entire omission from this recommendation of any suggestion for the improvement of native agriculture and native food production, which, as I point out in Chapter XXVI, is the first and fundamental requirement. The efficiency of the native as an "economic unit" is manifestly conceived of as primarily his efficiency as a wage-labourer.

"§ 415. The Commissioners forming the minority claim that the suggested change would bring the natives under the pressure of the law '*If a man does not work*[1] *neither shall he eat*,' and by doing so would set in motion certain potent forces which would start the native races of this country on the upward road more than any legislation which could be devised.

"§ 416. The view of the majority of the Commission on the subject of the tenure of land by natives in what are known as reserves distinctly differs from

[1] *I.e.* for a white employer.

that set forth above. The majority **reject as historically incorrect the view that such land has been given up for the use of the natives without the existence of any antecedent right on their part.** With the exception of certain cases in which land has been granted to native tribes as an act of grace or in reward for special services (*e.g.* as was done for the Fingos in what is known as Fingoland), **the people are at present in occupation of the ancestral land held by their forefathers.** Often the area of this ancestral land has been restricted, and several of the tribes occupy considerably less than the extent of country formerly held by them. In the main the natives have distinct rights which should be regarded as rights of ownership, and there is no justification for the assumption that they ought to be regarded as in occupation merely as tenants at will of the Crown and subject to the payment of annual rent for the use and enjoyment of the land. **These tribes came under European Government in most cases by peaceful annexation and did not understand that the transfer of sovereign rights to the Crown involved the surrender or forfeiture of land-ownership. Therefore, a special tax based on land values and on the assumption that the natives have been provided with land and should pay rent for it, would be unjust and would be so regarded by them.**

"§ 417. The taxation of the native should be based upon considerations as to what may be deemed to be an adequate contribution, with a due regard to his means and capacity to contribute to the revenue, and to the proportion of public expenditure which may be chargeable to native administration. Any form of indirect taxation alone would not be effective in dealing with a people who at present are only commencing to develop a necessity for the taxable commodities of European civilised life. Native contributions to revenue have, therefore, to be supplemented by direct taxation, and the form of hut-tax or poll-tax applied where they are domiciled and where they occupy the land is the most convenient and equitable.

"§ 418. The majority of the Commission deprecate the view that any calculation of the amount of land in occupation of natives can be based upon the total area of reserves referred to in the argument of the minority and shown in Annexure No. 8. The total of 220,470 square miles includes an area of no less than 127,630 square miles in the Bechuanaland Protectorate which has already been described in this Report as 'much of it waterless and unproductive,' and which carries a population of ·78 to the square mile. The table in Annexure No. 8 shows the density of the population on the remainder of the reserves as varying from 6·80 in Southern Rhodesia to 132·81 in the Orange River Colony. Excluding the extreme figures, the density of the population in reserves in the Cape Colony, Natal, the Transvaal, and Basutoland is such that the *majority regard the conclusion that* 2,458,281 *of the native population are occupying* 141,100,800 *acres of land as fallacious and misleading. A calculation as to distribution of land that may more appropriately be made is that* 4,652,662 *natives are allotted in South Africa* 220,370 *square miles of land as against* 694,303 *square miles owned by* 1,680,529 *Europeans and others.*"

(I may here interpolate, anticipating what will appear in the next following chapter, that the Native Commissioners, Dr Roberts and Dr Loram, now estimate that the *rural* whites, numbering 671,980, share to-day between them 125,890,000 morgen of land, and the *rural* blacks, numbering 4,110,813, share between them 16,973,400 morgen; allowing on an average for each white person 43¾ morgen for each single morgen left for the black.)

"§ 419. The Natal representatives do not concur with the resolutions of the Commission on taxation, with the exception of the first two clauses, with which they agree.

"They are of opinion, however, in view of the increase in wages and in the cost of administration, that natives generally, but especially those who reside on lands set apart for them as locations and

reserves and who do not pay rent, are under-taxed at the present time where the hut-tax is less than £1 per hut annually. They therefore agree that where the present hut-tax is less than £1 it should be brought up to that figure as a maximum, except in the case of natives in locations and reserves as already stated, in which case they think that the maximum should be 30s.

"As an alternative to the payment of hut-tax, they would be in favour of a poll-tax of £1 per annum payable by all male natives above the age of eighteen and under fifty years residing on locations or reserves where no rent is paid, provided that chiefs and headmen, who fill official positions, are exempted, and that poll-tax takes the place of hut-tax and any obligation to render compulsory service.

"In respect of Natal, *where natives are called upon to render compulsory labour*, they are of opinion that this obligation should cease on the imposition of increased taxation up to and above £1 per annum."

The criticism passed in § 381 by the Natal Commissioners on the institution of compulsory labour for public services is exceedingly interesting, because it enunciates a principle for which the advocates of natives' rights have had most strenuously to contend in regard to the Colony of Kenya administered under the control of the British Colonial Office. The principles here advocated have still to be applied there as regards some of their implications. This section embodies an interesting and moderate statement of the belief that pressure upon natives to work for a white employer is desirable in the interests of the natives themselves as well as of the State, and of the "development of the natural sources of the country." The interests of the State are presumably the interests of the people who compose the State, and the advantage of the development of the great natural resources of the country might be presumed to be the advantage also of the people who occupy the country: and as the natives form the plurality of these it

is difficult to see why their interests should be distinguished from the two previously specified interests by being spoken of in a third category. The clue to this puzzle is clearly given by the language which follows, insisting that what must be kept in view in all legislative and administrative measures is a policy which at least will not perpetuate or aggravate the existing "labour difficulty." Labour difficulty, as I have pointed out, means (in the minds of the class of persons who, when invited to consider the native question, habitually discuss it simply from the point of view of regarding the natives as "labour") the difficulty of a white employer in getting black men to leave their own concerns and work for him. Neither these Commissioners nor, so far as my reading goes, any other Commissioners up to the date of the Economic and Wages Commission, which has been appointed to discuss native affairs in South Africa or even in Kenya, have appeared to be conscious that whilst it may be difficult it may also be advantageous to pursue such a policy as may operate to encourage the native directly, and not through pressure, to work for himself. It cannot, these Commissioners say, "but be an advantage to the natives to be induced without compulsion to become more industrious." Quite so: and the most important question for African statesmanship is whether it is not easier, to say nothing of its being more practicable, to induce them without compulsion to become more industrious for their own purposes than, with or without compulsion, to become more industrious as employees of the white man. The theory now predominant in South Africa (although it is by no means exclusively operative there, because the liberal intelligent line of policy has been attempted with some success in the Transkei[1] native territories in the Cape Province) is that the native cannot be induced to become industrious for the profit of the white employer without some degree of compulsion. The whole argument of this book aims at explaining that it is not only natural that this should be the case, but that, in fact, experience shows that it is the case. When the pioneers of white capitalist imperial development were given their head in

[1] But the holdings allowed (4 to 8 acres) are too small to maintain native families without additional wage labour. See p. 158.

the Chartered Company's territory and in the East African Protectorate, they promptly acted upon the presumption that the black man ought to work for them, but would not do so without some form of compulsion. They began with direct compulsion of labour, first of all ostensibly for public purposes, especially transport by porterage, interpreted in the most possible liberal manner, and they extended the policy into an attempt directly to compel the natives who might be supposed not to be working in their own homes to work on the estates of private employers. Concurrently with these direct modes of pressure it has been the continuous policy of white Governments, in the northern territories of the Union and in Rhodesia, to put pressure on the native to work by exacting from him rent for living on the land of his own country, which has been taken from him by the white man and also by imposing upon him, as also in Kenya, hut-taxes and poll-taxes, to find the money for which he has to go out to work for wages in the mines, on white men's farms, or on Government public works, or in such other employment as he can find in the cities, his employment in all cases being not a free weekly employment but a statutory form of continuous servitude to a particular employer, under the Masters' and Servants' Laws, for any breach of which he is liable to punishment through the Courts and may be visited by his master with "reasonable" chastisement and discipline. These principles are reflected in the recommendations of § 383, which some of the Commissioners thought not stiff enough, adding their improved recommendations in § 386.

§ 410 deals with the question of the rent to be exacted from natives for living upon what were their own lands and are still their only homes. Natives so resident are called in these territories "squatters"—a word which might be supposed to mean that they had imposed themselves on other men's property; the fact being that the property was appropriated under their feet. This exaction of rents from natives, ranging from 20s. to 40s. for each adult, is one of the unredressed exactions imposed by the Chartered Company in Rhodesia, which it is a disgrace to the British Colonial Office to have allowed to be so imposed, even whilst the Chartered Company were claiming the

lands as their own, and a still greater disgrace to have allowed to be maintained on unalienated Crown Lands after the Company were dispossessed of their usurpation by the judgment of the Privy Council and to have allowed subsequently to be maintained by the Southern Rhodesia Government. The Southern Rhodesia Lands Commission of 1926 raised a question of the propriety of this exaction, but the Government have now apparently finally determined to maintain it. It is pure brigandage of the most barbarous and mediæval type of invader's policy.

The reason given by the minority in § 412 for exacting rents from the natives exhibits that simplicity of mind that is so characteristic of Africanders in dealing with questions of native rights, with entire unconsciousness of the applicability of such principles to themselves. They say that the natives should pay for the benefits they receive from the State, and that among these benefits not the least is the peaceful use and occupation of large tracts of country, aggregating 141,000,000 acres throughout South Africa, free of rent. These are the lands which Europeans have abstained from taking away from the natives. The lands which Europeans, who are one-third as numerous as the natives, have appropriated for their own use and emolument, are about thirteen times the extent of the natives' lands : but the Europeans do not pay rent to the Government for them. Yet the argument seems at least equally applicable. If rents should be paid to the State—a principle which is arguable—they should be paid equally by all occupiers of land : and at any rate the native's equitable title is (see § 416, pp. 148, 149, *supra*) the older and better. An intelligent and equitable Government would levy a reasonable tax on all lands proportional to their valuation.

In the recent Report of Sir E. Hilton Young's Commission on Closer Union in Eastern and Central Africa [Cmd. 3234, 1929] the attention of the British Government is again invited to this question of the rights of natives in their own land, immense areas of which have been taken away from them and granted to European syndicates or are being held as Crown property in Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland. It remains to be seen whether this latest appeal will be more effectual with the Colonial Office now

that their duty of trusteeship for natives is being officially advertised than previous efforts have been.

§§ 413, 414, and 415 form an admirable compendium of Africander native land and labour policy. It might be taken as the textbook of those settler politicians who so energetically promote the policy of Africanderising Kenya.

I think that, in combination with the comments I have interpolated, the two sections of the Commission have sufficiently illustrated in these extracts this part of the theme which I seek to elucidate, namely, the general attitude of educated South Africans towards the natives, both from the landowner's and employer's point of view—that of local capital—and from the more liberal and sympathetic point of view of which Col. Stanford figures as the most clear-headed representative. I feel myself specially indebted to the "minority" for formulating the characteristic views of white capital in regard to coloured labour. If I had myself merely imputed these views I should doubtless have been accused, as I have been by critics of *The Anatomy of African Misery*, of ignorant and uncharitable misrepresentation.

CHAPTER XIV

COLOURED LABOUR IN SOUTH AFRICA

II

FURTHER pursuing the method followed in the last chapter, I propose concisely to indicate the contemporary situation in regard to the relations of white capital and coloured labour in South Africa by some extracts from the great mass of evidence given to the Select Committee of the South African Parliament appointed to examine and report on the Bills embodying the residue of General Hertzog's Native Affairs programme, left undisposed of after the passing of the Native Affairs Regulation Laws of 1926 and 1927 and the Colour-Bar Law of 1926.

The result, I may say, of the proceedings of this Select Committee was that they found themselves unable to report upon the Bills without further consideration, and recommended that they should be carried over till the following session: the probable upshot being that no further action will be taken upon them until after a fresh General Election.

Dr ROBERTS (*Chief Commissioner for Native Affairs*).—"We are agreed that there is not sufficient land set aside in portions of the Cape and the Orange Free State for native occupation."

Dr LORAM (*Commissioner for Native Affairs*).—"Our present squatting system will have to be changed for a system of tenant-farming in European areas by natives. I think this will be forced upon us by two things. One is the inadequacy of the land that has been set aside by the proposals in this Bill; and secondly, the requirements of the white man for a supply of labour that he can call upon when he needs it.

"In regard to the adjustment of land between the natives

and Europeans you could not expect more under present conditions, considering the intensity of feeling in Natal and even in the Transvaal on the part of the Europeans; not that it is what one would regard, apart from this objection, as being a fair allocation."

Dr Roberts.—"I am certainly of opinion that the present allocation of land is such as to drive natives into the industrial centres. I will give you a case in point. In the Glen Grey district the population at the last census, that of 1921, was 41,836. This shows a decrease of 7793 on the 1911 census. There are also decreases in the native population at Alexandria of 1448; Bedford, 562; Fort Beaufort, 1068; Kingwilliamstown, 2305; Victoria, East, 1160. That makes a total of 14,336, representing a sixth of the rural natives in these districts.

"Taking the whole population *in the Cape Province*, including the workers among the Europeans, the land allocated to natives works out at 4·3 morgen per head."

Dr Loram.—"I do not admit that the native is located in the most fertile parts of the country."

Dr Roberts.—"I know that the natives who get only 6s. or 10s. per month have also got the right to run a certain amount of stock on the farmer's veld; but, as you will see, the wage will only give them £6 per year. A suit of clothes is dear to a European, but sometimes more so to the native; then he has to pay £1 poll-tax straight off, as well as other taxes. I think, if you will regard the wage in relation to his needs, you will agree that he gets too little. . . . I do think the natives are getting poorer and are so being forced to go to work for the white man. I would not say that the white people are also getting poorer, judging by the financial condition of the country. A country that is able to give £30,000,000 to the State cannot be called poor.

"The native has the right to-day to buy land in the Cape Province, but if you take away his franchise you take away that right."

Dr Loram.—"If we take away from the white population the 847,508 urban whites and we take away from the native population the 587,000 urban blacks, we are left with 125,890,600 *morgen of land to be shared by* 671,980 *rural whites and making a morgenage of* 187·3 *per rural white*;

while, if we take away the urban blacks from the total black population, we are left with 16,973,400 *morgen of scheduled and released land to be divided among a population of* 4,110,813 *rural blacks, working out on an average for the whole Union of* 4·1 *morgen per rural black.* That is, each rural white has on the average 45¾ times as much land as each rural black."

[Dr Loram seems here to speak too summarily—for the 'released areas' were merely to be areas in which native chiefs *might* buy land—they have not got it yet. The disproportion between the actual holdings and reserves as between white and black is even greater than he indicates.]

"Now, if we take Mr Stubbs' estimate of what he regarded as necessary land[1] for a rural black family at 18¼ morgen, we should remember that when he made that calculation in 1917 he based it on a family of five with 3 head of large stock and 9 head of small stock and a certain amount of agricultural land. I cannot think that 3 head of large stock and 9 head of small stock is excessive for a family of five. If we take the extent of the scheduled and released areas to-day they would give us room for 4,650,000 black individuals on the Stubbs basis, so we could not to-day put all our black population into the scheduled and released areas and give them the minimum that Stubbs and his committee thought necessary.

"After seeing the wonderful irrigation works in the Tugela and Mooi River valleys carried on by the Native Affairs Department in Natal with its closer settlement schemes, one realises that under such conditions the natives can make a living out of much less than four morgen of ground.

"Although it is against the law of the United States to have segregated areas in the cities, the negroes tend to go to one part. They have the whole of New York to live in, but they prefer to go to one particular area, Haarlem. There is a voluntary and natural segregation which is entirely right. This form of compulsory segregation contemplated by the Act of 1913 is new.

"The natives go to work in European areas because they must do so. They require to pay taxes, to send their children to school, and to clothe themselves, and their fields

[1] See note on p. 152, *supra*.

will not give them the necessary amount of money. In my opinion the natives are getting poorer, and so they are compelled to go out to work. Prices have gone up, but their wages have remained practically stationary.

"The effect of § 16 also would be to drive out a number of tenant farmers: they would be compelled to take service with farmers for whom they would not want to work.

"The natives recommend the deletion of Chapter II. They were afraid that its application would simply mean that they would be compelled to go and work on farms and in other employment that they did not care about. If the licences are applied it will certainly mean a transfer of the population from one farm to another and also from farms to the towns. That is the reason why they use that word 'enslavement.' Of the 600,000 natives living on farms, from about one-third to one-half will probably be affected by it. It would dislocate the whole economic position of the European and of the native if these clauses were immediately put into force. The idea of segregation from this aspect of the question is impracticable, because we are not able to give the dispossessed natives enough land to occupy if we prevent a considerable portion from settling on the farms as squatters or tenants."

Dr Roberts.—"The native must for another century be a worker for the European, and I do not see how you can get any other to take his place to-day. I think the native should, as far as possible, be induced to remain in his own areas. I hold that it is the white man's blame that he is in the towns to-day. The native goes to the town for certain definite reasons. The first is in order to get money to pay his taxes. If you ask the native why he is in town he will tell you at once, as I was told this morning, 'I am down here to get money to pay my taxes,' and he handed me a long list of taxes that he had to pay. The poll-tax last year was not put on the native with my recommendation.[1] I was very strongly against it, and I think it is a most unjust tax. There is nothing to commend it. If we want to tax the native, tax him according to the ordinary way that civilised men are taxed—that is, on his possessions, his cattle.

1 *I.e.* the advice of the Native Affairs Commission is overruled in such questions of Native Policy.

I do not think that the tax of last year has added very much to the native unrest. The native is rather acquiescent. These are the strange not understandable things the white man does, and he accepts them.

"With regard to segregation I am not able to answer for the policy of the country, but I hold that total segregation, territorially even, is not possible."

Charles Sakwe, Elijah Quaata, and William Mlandu, Transkei Natives.—"We strongly urge the Government and Parliament to take cognisance of the strong race consciousness that exists among the native peoples of the Union. It is not engendered by an anti-white feeling. It has come about in a quite natural way, and is, in fact, in keeping with the policy of social separation of the black and white races. The natives of the Cape Province have often, without just and reasonable cause, been accused of striving for social equality with Europeans. There never was such a desire in the whole Union."

Dr Loram.—"I think that while we have the Land Act as it stands on our Statute Book without adequate areas for natives, and while we have the colour-bar on the Statute Book, we are going to find it hard to meet the arguments and criticisms of people overseas in Europe and America.

"I wish members of the committee knew how natives feel about the 1913 Act. It is the chief thing, I think, we have done in this country to lose their confidence."

[It may be explained that besides restricting the right of natives to buy land in "European" districts, and providing no new districts for them as promised, pressure was put on them to drive them into the labour market by forbidding farmers in the "European" districts to allow them to remain as squatters, on what were formerly their own lands, except in the position of labour tenants or contract labourers.]

Messrs William Elliott, Alexander Stone, and August Jansen (*Natal Agricultural Union*).—Mr Elliott: "In approaching this question I do so not merely as a native question but as a European, and we have to face the fact that in this country we shall sooner or later have to make strenuous efforts to maintain our European civilisation. The next step will be that the natives will ask for repre-

sentation on the same basis as the European, and the result may be that the natives will make it impossible and intolerable for the Europeans to live in this country.

"We do feel it is extremely dangerous for European civilisation to be built up on a black base and then to admit them to representation on our supreme governing body.

"I would not give the educated native who has left tribal conditions any share in the government of the country so far as the European Parliament is concerned. You ask whether I think that could be maintained for any length of time; but, to be quite frank, my own personal opinion on this point is that the time must come when we shall have to fight for our position in this country. You ask whether it is my idea that things should have to be decided by force and that if we want to hold our own we must exterminate them. I think it will either be that, or I do not know what it is going to be.

"We do not want things to develop as in the Cape, and the native to be given the vote. We have definite ideas on the subject.

"I am afraid whatever we may now do there will eventually be a clash between black and white. I am speaking of things as we have them in Natal. There is a considerable amount of unrest in Natal. We have seen in the newspaper recently that the Industrial and Commercial Workers' Union [1] have 20,000 members in Durban and 4000 in Pietermaritzburg.

"I do not think it would be fair to the native in the Cape to take away his franchise. In dealing with this question the dominant thing in our minds has not been justice at all, but we must conserve as far as we can with European civilisation in this country."

[European civilisation, in South Africa, is evidently not understood to imply justice.]

"I regret I cannot moderate my opinion that the European will have to take a strong line if he is to maintain civilisation in this country. I said that an injustice had been done by the 1913 Act by taking away from the native certain rights he had and placing nothing in their place, and you ask whether I would not apply that to the franchise of the

[1] The typical employer's view is here expressed that the formation of any workers' trade union is a sign of "unrest" and therefore seditious.

native in the Cape. My view is this, that when we come to a question of this kind, theories and *abstract justice* do not weigh with me, it becomes a question of race, the preservation of European civilisation in this country."

Messrs Greathead, Owen, Lyons, and Parsons (*Transvaal Landowners' Association*).—"In every case the immediate effect of the coming into operation of this Act will be wholesale evictions, and that will apply not only to our land but to every landowner in that area, and as we foresee this contingency we want a simple and inexpensive manner of eviction.

"In reply to your question as to where the natives are going to find land if the farmers evict them, I would say that the Government has surely satisfied itself that they can be accommodated.

"The reason why we keep the natives on is that the Government has requested us over and over again to keep them on our ground because they have not got land for them."

Mr Lyons.—"The rent that we charge the natives does not include grazing; that is extra. We charge so much a head for large stock and so much a head for small stock in addition to the £2 rent. We charge £2 per male, with an additional £1 for each additional wife, and in addition to that the natives have to pay 3s. grazing for each head of large stock and 6d. for small stock. We have great difficulty in collecting these rents. It costs us 50 per cent. on all collections. We have to wipe off another 20 per cent. in respect of natives who have absconded and in respect of other things. We have sold nearly four million acres of our land since 1918."

Mr Greathead.—"Over and over again the Government has come to us and said these people will be homeless, and we must leave them there, and this system has become established by agreement between proprietor and the Native Affairs Department.

"We still own 3½ million morgen of land, and in the past seven years we have practically entirely sold to Europeans; we have sold to a few natives."

Mr Howard Pim (*Chartered Accountant, Johannesburg*). —"Experience in Africa as well as in Europe has brought to

light the following cardinal principles of a constructive land policy:—

1. Adequate land and facilities for ownership and leasing.
2. The legal and economic status for the land occupier and worker defined by means of written contract.
3. Security of tenure and ability to reap fruits of labour.
4. Active supervision and encouragement of agricultural development.

In all four respects agrarian policy in South Africa, in so far as the native is concerned, has been extremely defective, except perhaps in the Transkei.

"The effect of the Bill as published if rigorously enforced will be to sweep large numbers of natives out of their present habitats, whether on the High, Middle, or Low Veld, and to force them either to take up residence in the released areas provided or else to accept conditions of life on what terms may be offered on farms scattered throughout the Union and as whole-time servants. A very limited number only will be able to continue as squatters in their present surroundings. Natives in this district thus uprooted in large numbers will for the most part have no adequate cash or means for purchasing land, nor will they have been united in well-defined tribes. Their cattle, which represent the savings from their work, painfully scraped together over long periods, will either have to be realised at forced prices or moved to fresh areas where cattle diseases are rife, and where they will be liable to contract all sorts of troubles to which in their former surroundings they had become comparatively immune. An animal reared on a certain area may become immune to red water and gall sickness within that area, but if moved to a different area it often contracts these diseases and dies. Much of the land within the released area, or within any area which could be set aside as a released area, is entirely raw and unbroken, and considerable tracts are quite unfit to support human life. Any land that is already broken has already been occupied. The released area is for the most part poorly watered and directly the foothills are left fever conditions become more and more rampant. Natives accustomed to the higher

regions will be peculiarly susceptible to fever and other low veld diseases, and at the outset and for a considerable time conditions will bear very hardly indeed upon those natives thus moved into entirely unaccustomed surroundings.

"Any sudden attempt to move natives in large numbers from one area to another can have only disastrous results. The difference in climate, soil, rain, and temperature is very wide. The extent of the released area is quite inadequate for the support of the natives who will be affected."

Professor MACMILLAN (*Johannesburg University*).—"Everybody agrees that squatting is an unsatisfactory condition, but squatters are so numerous to-day just because in the past reserves had not been created for the natives to live there. From the point of view of the native himself squatting is the most favourable condition open to him and is to-day the best chance for the native. The effect of the white labour policy is an industrial restriction on the native, and that policy is recommended generally. The fact that there are more natives in industry to-day than there have ever been before is due to the fact that there are more industries in South Africa. They are being employed in the lower grades and have not anything like adequate openings above. They cannot work where there are colour-bar restrictions. The mere existence of the Colour-Bar Act on the statute book is doing a lot of damage."

R. V. S. THEMA.—"I attribute the driving of the natives from the land to the town mainly to the working of the 1913 law and not to the increase of industries and the consequent greater demand for labour. I have always seen in the newspaper that there is a scarcity of labour on farms all over the Union; but the reason why the unemployed natives of Johannesburg do not go to the farms is that the farmers [1] do not pay wages. One of the reasons why there are such a lot of unemployed natives in Johannesburg is the Government's white labour policy with regard to employment on the railway."

Professor MACMILLAN.—"I want to emphasise that it is absolutely necessary to carry native opinion with us if we

[1] They exact labour, by way of rent, from the native and all his family, for permission to live on the farm.

want to have any policy that will work satisfactorily for the progress of the country.

"The discontent which is abroad among the natives no doubt goes back a long way, but it has become more and more acute since the passing of the 1913 Land Act. In the second place the War, *qua* War, was a very severe shock to the native mentality. It set them thinking. Again the material effects of the War bore on them very hardly. A protective policy has been adopted in the interests of the development of industry in the Union. That protective policy has laid, for example, an extraordinarily heavy tax on native blankets. The advocates of this protective policy have urged it strongly as a means of fostering what they hope will be largely white labour industries, with too little regard for obvious native needs and interests, as in the matter of this duty on blankets. All the emphasis has been laid on the desirability of employing white labour in industries generally, and the native knows it. The natives have been faced by the Government's civilised labour policy, which tends to the closing of avenues long opened to natives, and principally the better and more educated sort of native—for example, on the railways. On the top of that there came the Colour-Bar Act of last year. Against these grievances and disabilities there is very little to point to as having been done for the natives' benefit in the last few years and particularly little to strike their imagination as obviously popular and beneficial. There is one outstanding measure, perhaps, the very useful creation of the Native Development Fund. This Act brought some relief to Northern natives, but for the Cape it often meant an actual increase of taxation, rising in some instances from as little as 12s. per annum to the uniform 30s. In the Cape, whose natives are very numerous, probably the poorest, and threatened now with at least the curtailment of their franchise, it means an increase of taxation. In any case that fund is not a gift from the Union Funds, it is merely taxing the natives themselves.

"The whole history has demonstrated to the natives in general that the effect of the Cape franchise is its own best testimonial.

"It is because the Cape people have been represented in Parliament that they have better facilities for educa-

tion than we have in the North. It is true that certain reactionary measures have passed through the Union Parliament in spite of the fact that the natives in the Cape had got the vote. That is evidence of the growing strength of the Northern and non-Cape view. Since Union there has been a heavy weigh-down towards a less liberal view."

Mr Abercrombie.—"The native in this country is really about one-quarter as efficient as the lowest type of negro labourer in the United States, and I say that we have a very promising future for this country if we devote ourselves to the economic study of the native question. The farmers in this country have a big duty to perform to improve the efficiency of the natives. In the United States they have gone so far as to have extension officers dealing with negroes who are farming on their own.[1] That to my mind is the first step towards securing efficiency amongst the natives. These natives who are farming on their own, wherever they may be, should be encouraged and assisted so that the whole of their families and other natives when trained should go out and they would then be of much assistance to the farmers. The more efficient they become the higher will be their wage value, and if the farmer could get value for his money and a profit on the transaction he would be prepared to pay a higher wage."

Mr Wessels, O.F.S.—"We do see, as is a well-known fact, that the native to-day pays more for land in the Transvaal than the white man, and he is also learning to farm intensively."

Dr T. Jabavu.—"Every black man who is a voter has *ipso facto* abandoned the position of barbarism. We are ranged on the side of civilisation. Our interests are intertwined with civilised interests."[2]

Wesleyan Native Church, Queenstown, September 1927.—"If it is the desire and intention of the ruling race to govern the natives of this country with justice and consideration and to adjust their methods to suit the developments and changing needs of the natives; if they realise and recognise the grave responsibilities resting upon them as guardians and trustees of the native races of this country, we think that it is absol-

[1] See further from Dr Jabavu's evidence at the end of Chapter II, p. 43.
[2] See Chapter XXVI.

utely essential that the natives should be allowed and encouraged to think and discuss openly, frankly, and freely the position assigned to them by those in authority over them. We have been forced by bitter experience to come to the conclusion that it is impossible for European genius and culture alone, without the co-operation and assistance of the natives, to discover an accurate basis for the adjustment of their respective misunderstanding and differences."

Dr Rubusana.—"Yesterday I stated that there was a state of ferment amongst the natives in the Eastern province over the native bills. I meant that for a considerable time the natives have been fed up with the pin-prick policy of the Government or of the white people, as they say. This feeling has grown up out of small things. In the first place, they found that they were always singled out for legislation on account of their colour. At first these things were small, but they have gradually developed into bigger things. They go to railway stations and find every seat marked 'Europeans only.' It does not matter where they go, they always find this, and it is these little things that count and make them feel that they are not regarded as passengers. They did not first of all think very much of these things, but as these things went on from one to another they found that they were not regarded as citizens by the white people in this country, but that they were regarded, on account of their colour, as people who are foreigners in their own country. When Parliament singled them out for special legislation they said: 'We do not know how far this thing is going to continue; there must be something at the back of this legislation. What do the white people want to do; do they want to drive us out of the country? They have taken away our land; they have taken away everything from us. What more do they want? They have practically deposed our chiefs and regarded them as headmen, and there is now no difference between a man who is a chief of royal blood and an ordinary commoner who is called a headman. What is it all? What does it all mean?' Is there any wonder now that they look upon everything done by Europeans with suspicion? They say, 'This is not all, there is something more coming behind.' And that is why they have always been in that state of

ferment. When the Land Act of 1913 came into force they were so agitated that they were practically driven from their senses and said: 'Well now, they have not been satisfied to take away our land; they want to take over all the land we have; they want to drive us to the sea.' That is the position."

Dr Jabavu.—"Social rights have nothing to do with political rights, because social rights are a matter of our own choice. If I were living in Cape Town I would like to live among my own people and not in Tamboerskloof. The Bantu race do not desire social intermixture with whites. We Bantu people are so proud of ourselves and our traditions and we identify ourselves so much with our own people that in this country the social danger you refer to does not exist. Our complaint about railway-station seats and sheds being marked 'Europeans only' is that there is no parallel and equivalent accommodation made for black people; there is no 'black only.' At most of the railway sidings there is only one waiting-room put up and marked Europeans only. There is no room for us and we suffer severely in wet weather."

Rev. Z. R. Mahabame (*African Native Congress*).—"I hardly think we shall ever be able to have a majority in Parliament whatever our numbers, and even if we did have it I believe the intellect of the white man is stronger than that of the black man, and the former will always take the leadership and control affairs. If the Bantu people are admitted into full citizenship I believe there will be peace all over the land. There will be no suspicions, and the native industrial workers will enjoy the same rights as the European workers. They will get satisfactory wages and conditions of labour, and that spells peace."

Rev. H. B. Coventry (*Cape Native Welfare Society*).—"We claim that there is no adequate reason based on ascertained facts for holding that the native as such is incapable of assimilating even the outward form of the essential spirit of our civilisation. We cannot prove that he is incapable of full manhood as we ourselves understand it. The danger to our civilisation does not arise from any natural incapacity of the native people; but it may arise from artificial repression that seeks to keep them on a lower level of attainment than they desire and have power to

accomplish. We cannot damp down the spirit of progress without by that very act creating a real danger of future explosion. In such repression we see possible disaster for our country. Race consciousness once roused, as it must be under such treatment, will lead to a growing resentment against alien control and the accompanying stigma of inferiority. Racialism cannot be admitted on one side without provoking an equally intense racialism on the other. The native question is not and cannot be a merely national question, and as a world question it is important to remember that the coloured people are two and a half times as numerous as the white.

"We are left, then, with the mere will to subjugate, and this must be repugnant to the moral sense of every true man. Such a spirit is a denial of the elementary principle of justice and is itself a deadly attack upon the foundations of the very civilisation we seek to preserve. We cannot uphold our white civilisation by destroying its basic principle. If by white civilisation we mean the white man's standard of living, then the principle is proven in Trade Union movements in other countries and recognised in the report of the economic and wage commission of 1925, that the only way to secure this is to elevate the standard of living of the bottom dog for good. The white man's standard of living will never be secure while it is built up on the degraded mass of cheap native labour."

Mr L. D. Gilson, M.L.A.—"I think that in this country the interests of the natives are bound up with the interest of the white people. As long as the natives vote with the white people they think their interests can never be endangered, but if you separate them they will think there will be a tendency to legislate, to their disadvantage."

Archbishop Carter.—"Personally I believe in trusting these people, and I believe you will do more in trusting them than you will in any way of restriction. My experience of the native is that the more you trust him and give him responsibilities the more he will rise to the responsibility imposed on him. Anything in the way of restriction he feels as a stumbling-block and will prevent him from rising to a higher condition.

"I should say that if a man is qualified to vote he should

be allowed to vote. Is there any reason why a difference should be made between white and black? Personally I believe the right way to proceed is to give the natives equal rights with the white man. Do it slowly if you like, and raise the qualification."

Notwithstanding the recently increased manifestations of racial prejudice, historical ignorance, and political short-sightedness which have conduced to the programme of Native Affairs Bills passed or proposed by the South African Government, a tendency has been evident since the Report of 1905 towards a more rational recognition of the necessities of the situation. Compulsory labour in Natal has been abolished, the Wages Regulation Board has decided that it must deal with questions of wages brought before it without any reference to colour. This attitude was disturbing to South African notions, but its educative value has been great in that it has brought the community face to face with the real impossibility of industrial segregation. It has also been recently proposed on the part of the Government that natives should be brought within the scope of the Industrial Disputes Regulation Law. The effect of both these developments may be, at the outset, unfavourable to the employment of natives, but the best friends of the natives have advised them to welcome such recognition of equality of industrial rights. A certain amount is being done (as witnesses before the Select Committee urged is so very necessary) towards promoting improved methods of agriculture by the trading and employment of native demonstrators to work among the natives. This work is provided for at the cost of the Native Development Fund raised by the special taxation referred to by Professor Macmillan in the evidence quoted above.

In November 1928, moreover, General Hertzog was led to reconstruct his Government by an incident importantly symptomatic of readjustments in the relations between the white and the coloured workers. General Hertzog dissolved his Government because, contrary to his demand, Mr Madeley, Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, had received a deputation from the (Native) Industrial and Commercial Workers' Union. Mr Madeley refused to resign, and in

order to get rid of him General Hertzog resigned and reconstructed his Government.

Mr Madeley's recognition of the Industrial and Commercial Workers' Union and his reception of a deputation from it would have been in itself a remarkable portent. It defied the Colour-Bar and White Labour policy of General Hertzog's Government, supported by the South African (White) Labour Party. It also ignored the Government's attitude towards the Industrial and Commercial Workers' Union, which General Hertzog has declared to be not a Trade Union but a seditious conspiracy. Its leader, Mr Clements Kadalie, has been repeatedly prosecuted, precisely as the early Trade Unionists of Great Britain were prosecuted by the Governments of their time. So far, thanks to the intractable equity of the South African Courts, such prosecutions have consistently failed, notwithstanding the enactment of the Native Affairs Regulation Law of 1927, which embodied a clause, known as the "Kadalie clause," specially framed to enable that undesired agitator to be laid by the heels: just as the Colour-Bar Law of the same year was framed to purge the inconvenient colour-blindness of the South African Constitution as declared by the Courts in the Hildick-Smith case.

But even more significant and important was the fact that the deputation received by Mr Madeley was organised by representatives of the South African Trades Union Congress, and was introduced by Mr W. H. Andrews, Secretary of the Congress. Mr Andrews was a member of the Economic and Wages Commission of 1925, and he and Mr F. Lucas, Chairman of the Wage Board, in their minority report condemned the proposed Colour-Bar Law as unjustifiable and bound to be futile. They pointed out the only road towards abating the evils of the competition of the depressed native industrial worker with the white, namely, to encourage the organisation of native wage-workers in recognised Unions, which would both enable them to raise their wage standard and bring them, as our own unskilled workers have been brought during the last forty years, into organised association with the skilled workers' Unions. And, further, that the application of the useful industrial laws now confined to white labour only should be extended to natives.

Two years ago, however, the majority of the Trades Union Congress were resolute to have nothing to do with the I.C.U., and the white Labour Party politicians were more resolute still. Mr Kadalie came to Europe and got his Union recognised by the International Labour Office, the British Trades Union Congress, and the International Federation of Trade Unions. In England he received help and advice from the Trades Union Council, through whose assistance Mr W. G. Ballinger, of Motherwell, was engaged by him to assist in the organisation of the I.C.U. and in putting its affairs on a proper basis. Mrs Etheldreda Lewis, the discoverer and editor of *Aloysius Horn*, had greatly interested herself in getting fair play for the I.C.U., which, to tell the truth, required a good deal of pulling together, and had, especially during Mr Kadalie's absence in Europe, been disastrously handled.

About twelve months ago the I.C.U. applied to the South African Trades Union Congress for affiliation, which was refused. The reason given was that as the I.C.U. claimed one hundred thousand members, it would on a card vote in any Congress be in a position to out-vote all the other Unions put together, which only number 20,000. Such a situation might very reasonably be considered unfair to the older Unions. Nevertheless, the memorandum of the Trade Union Co-ordinating Committee expressly stated that "that section of the workers who are willing and able to take the longer view is already convinced that repression or segregation (the colour bar) can only be partially successful, and then only for a time, and recognises that sooner or later the National Trade Union movement must include all genuine labour industrial organisations, irrespective of craft, colour, or creed."

Mr W. H. Andrews, who, as South African Labour delegate, took part in the discussions on South African Labour questions at the International Labour Office at Geneva this summer, subsequently attended the British Commonwealth Labour Conference held at Westminster in July. He there made it clear that his personal view does not differ materially from that held by our own Labour Party and subsequently declared by the International Labour and Socialist Congress at Brussels, and he explained

his reasons for holding that the best policy for the immediate future was not the amalgamation of the I.C.U. with the White Unions, but the development of a policy of co-ordination by means of periodical meetings for consultation on matters of common interest.

Mr Andrews, since his return to South Africa, together with other Europeans and Trade Unionists of "long views," has continued to promote with goodwill the intermediate policy to which he has committed himself, a policy repudiating any sort of industrial exclusiveness founded on racial distinctions.

The most significant recent development, anterior to the late political crisis which is partly one of its outcomes, was that on the 30th August last a joint meeting was held between the National Executive Council of the South African Trades Union Congress and the Executive of the Industrial and Commercial Workers' Union. Mr Moore, Chairman, T.U.C., in the chair, observed that that meeting might appear to be a very modest beginning, but that he believed it was the beginning of an important development in industrial organisation. The agenda were

(*a*) to discuss ways and means whereby the I.C.U. can be assisted in its Trade Union activities by the S.A. Trades Union Congress, and *vice versa*;
(*b*) in industries in which both organisations are interested, to prevent overlapping and misunderstanding;
(*c*) to have the S.A.T.U. Congress's active assistance in formulating demands for better wages and conditions;
(*d*) to discuss the ban placed on the I.C.U.'s Adviser's movements, and the general terms on which he has been allowed to come into the country;
(*e*) to discuss the Pass Laws and their abolition.

The chairman explained that the meeting was a consultative one and that any action taken would have to receive the approval of the organisations represented. Mr Kadalie expressed his agreement with the chairman that this was an epoch-making meeting, and acknowledged the assistance which had been given to himself by the National Executive

Council in protesting to the Government on the restrictions made on his movements within the Union.

The meeting resolved that the National Executive Committee should be requested to organise a deputation to the Minister of the Interior to protest against the ban placed by the Immigration Authorities on Mr Ballinger's movements and to request the Government to remove it immediately, so as to enable Mr Ballinger to pursue his legitimate Trade Union activities. The other matters on the agenda were discussed with general agreement.

Mr Andrews and the other Europeans who have thus associated themselves with the cause of the Industrial and Commercial Workers' Union appear to have turned the flank of the white Labour Party policy, and the position which they have taken up is one from which they are hardly likely to retreat, not only because it is implied in their own publicly declared convictions but because it is the only policy that commends itself to any intelligent critic of industrial sociology. The position of the I.C.U. and its significance in South African life are distinctly different from what they were before this little political shake up. No doubt there must be a great deal of further disintegration in the political Labour Party and also of controversy in the white Trade Union organisation before it can be seen clearly what further developments the new situation portends: but a new situation bringing South African Labour policy into line with that of the rest of the civilised world has unquestionably begun to disclose itself.

CHAPTER XV

NATIVE LABOUR IN PORTUGUESE AFRICA

In 1924 a Committee of Americans interested in the welfare of African natives invited Mr W. Alston Ross and Dr Cramer to visit the Portuguese Colonies in Africa for the study of native labour questions there. Mr Ross is Professor of Sociology in the University of Wisconsin and the author of many volumes dealing with sociology. He has made extensive journeys for sociological observation in China, India, Japan, South America, Russia, and Mexico. Dr Cramer is a New York physician of much experience, especially interested in psychology and psychiatry. He also has travelled widely and investigated social conditions not only in European countries but in Porto Rico, Brazil, Mexico, China, and Japan. These gentlemen carried out their inquiries in Portuguese Africa by direct contact with the natives in their own villages and through interpreters known to them and who were in their confidence. The summary of their conclusions, which they support by detailed notes of their observations, is as follows (it applies particularly to Angola):—

> "The labour system—virtually state serfdom—which has grown up in the Portuguese Colonies in recent years often claims so much of the natives' time and strength that they are no longer able to give adequate attention to the production of food in their own gardens and fields.
>
> "There is little evidence that any considerable part of the wages turned over in trust to the officials by the employers of natives hired from the Government actually reaches the hands of those to whom it belongs. It appears that the typical thing is for the earnings of these commandeered labourers to be embezzled.

"The amount of unpaid labour exacted of unskilled natives is not unfrequently so excessive that the young men see nothing to be gained by their acquiring skill in the missionary schools.

"Motor roads have been extended far beyond the needs of the colony, and the construction of such roads by conscripted, unpaid, unrationed natives—for the most part women,—with only the most primitive implements, imposes in some cases an almost crushing burden.

"There appears to be widespread labour stealing, *i.e.* the planter arbitrarily refuses to give credit or pay for certain days or half-days of labour which have been rendered him. We heard of no effort made by any official to curb this despicable practice.

"The official does not appear to be in a strong position with respect to his fellow Nationals, the traders and the planters, and hence rarely ventures to stand up for the rights of the natives as against the claims of a white man. The blacks feel that the Portuguese are leagued against them and that there is no recourse against the white man's violence and injustice.

"The native policemen (*cipaes*) utilised among stranger or enemy tribes grossly abuse their authority for purposes of lust, spite, or extortion. There is no regular channel provided by which the complaints of the natives thus wronged may be brought to the attention of the officials.

"The Government provides practically nothing in the way of schools, medical care, emergency relief, or justice against the white trader for the people of the villages as recompense for the heavy burden of unrequited toil it lays upon them.

"The treatment of the natives in Portuguese territory compares so unfavourably with that experienced by the natives in Rhodesia or in Belgian Congo that there is a strong tendency to emigrate across the frontier.

"In Portuguese East Africa the amount and manner of collection of the hut-tax impose severe hardships upon the natives.

"Before the whites came these African natives had made considerable progress in the industrial arts. They smelted iron, and native smiths made tools, weapons, and implements of iron. They had chickens, pigs, goats, sheep, cattle, and dogs. They grew various crops. They were backward chiefly in making cloth. Now for such people one part of advance is development of cultivation by the natives themselves. Schools may implant new wants—for clothing, better homes, cleanliness, sanitation, decency, chairs, tables, raised beds, cook stoves, schooling for children, eventually perhaps newspapers, books, amusements. At the same time the schools will show how to produce the means of gratifying these new wants. The brighter youths will learn carpentry, masonry, tailoring, iron work, brick-making, weaving, gardening, farming, poultry-raising, bee-keeping. The girls will learn to cook, sew, keep house, spin, make garments, weave baskets. The natives will be made acquainted with better methods of farming, better types of implements, improved varieties of domestic plants, fowls, animals. The world outside will obtain the cotton, sugar, coffee, rice, cocoa, palm nuts, and sisal which this part of Africa is fitted to produce. But from them the blacks will obtain a due equivalent, so that here a decent civilisation may develop.

"On the other hand, the Government may by grants create great estates, tilled by unpaid natives working under the hippo lash. Cowed and discouraged, the natives would have no incentive to acquire skill. As life becomes harder for them, the shoots of the higher civilisation among them will wither. They will take up with vices which will help them to forget their hopeless lot. The dominant whites will object to the missions teaching the 'niggers,' 'putting notions into their heads,' 'making them uppish,' and 'above their station.' The *fazendas* (estates) will eventually come into the hands of the more ruthless whites, for they can make more money out of them than the humane sort can, and will be able to offer more purchase-money for them than the humane can afford to refuse.

These whites will maintain handsome motor roads, plantation homes, and Government buildings with unrequited native labour. In the use of machinery, the application of science to industry and the adoption of luxuries, this regime will look like civilisation; but in reality it will be like a veneered barbarism.

"Which of these two types will prevail depends upon things which are yet to happen. It is certain, however, that one type or the other will win. An African colony cannot persist half the one thing and half the other. Free labour and forced labour will no more mix than oil and water. Provide the planter with as much forced labour as he requires, and the hours, pace, treatment, and pay of labour will become such that no free labourer in his senses will take employment with him."

In one respect Professor Ross found Portuguese methods of dealing with natives less drastic and thoroughgoing than those operating in British South Africa.

"When we resumed inquiries at Lorenzo Marques a European resident testified that on a Boer farm in the Transvaal last summer he saw the blacks treated with a harshness which he had never seen here. The Dutch do not allow the blacks to own land. Their lands were all forfeited and became white men's property. For a chance to occupy a bit of the white man's farm and raise food for his family he has to pay a perfectly preposterous rental in labour.[1] *Here* (*i.e.* in Portuguese East Africa) *at least the land has never been taken from under the natives' feet.*"

With regard to the system of forced labour carried on in Portuguese African territories I am able to also quote the following passages from letters from independent and, I have reason to believe, trustworthy correspondents:—

(1) "In Angola (1925) recruitment of native labour was arranged through the Government directing district officers to provide drafts from the villages in their areas.

[1] 180 days in the year. See also p. 164.

"No attempt was made by medical inspection of the drafts to secure that the labour recruited was physically fit for employment under the conditions of the contract. Labour was paid $\frac{2}{5}$ths of the Government labour rate during their time of service, the remaining $\frac{3}{5}$ths were theoretically payable on their return to their villages, through the district officer and the head man of the village.

"District officers are poorly paid officials, generally of a type and character corresponding to their pay.

"There is a point which I consider important in regard to the native labour question in Angola, and the opinion holds for other districts in Africa. Native labour should not be drafted from the high plateau districts of dry climate to the saturated climate of the northern rain forest and the mangrove coast lands. Labour should find employment in districts where the difference in climate and altitude is not extreme from that of their home village.

"It is in the economic interest of the employer that labour should be passed on engagement by a medical officer and that official medical service be provided for them during their employment."

(2) Extract from a letter dated 6/8/26: "The Government hires natives out to planters, etc., who pay the Government 6d. per head per day, and feed the men, which costs about 4d. a day. Theoretically they only impress those who fail to pay the hut- or head-tax of £2, 10s., but in practice they often take 'boys' who are in good places (often I was told on some trumped-up charge, *e.g.* stealing a reel of cotton). I stayed on a very well-managed sugar plantation, which has over 2000 'boys' from the Government. Being an English concern, they get fair play and seem well-fed and cheerful. Their rations are $2\frac{1}{4}$ lbs. mealie meal, 3 ozs. peanuts, and a ration of salt; but they may eat all the sugar cane they can. But I can imagine that they do not always get fair treatment. It is very hard to find out truth in South Africa—most hard in Portuguese East Africa, I imagine—especially if you can't talk the

lingo; and, besides, one never knows if what one is told is exceptional or the rule. But from my knowledge of what used to happen in Angola, I am disposed to believe that they are quite without any sense of justice in dealing with the natives. I got two instances of boy servants being put in durance vile, for no charge that was established before a Court. One boy was given back, on his master's discovering by accident what had happened—and making strong protest with the support of the British Consul. In the other case no charge was alleged; and when the employer wrote saying, that if the boy had committed any offence he would pay the fine as the boy was excellent in every way, he got a civil reply that they were sorry they could not let him have the boy back as they were very short of labour at the time."

(3) Extract from a letter dated October 1924: "Having lived and travelled all over South Africa, Rhodesia, Nyasaland, and Portuguese East Africa for the last twenty-eight years, and now being in London for a holiday, there are certain matters concerning the treatment of natives that I would like to bring to your notice. I was in Mozambique territory during the late war, and since January 1919 I have lived and travelled there continually, mostly hunting, and I was surprised to see that there appears to be no real freedom for the natives of this territory. From 1919 till 1921 I lived on the Zambesi River and have seen the officials and native police there pressing natives for labour against their wishes. On the one side of the river is the Mozambique Co.'s territory, and on the other the Boro and Luabo Prazos. Whole villages have crossed the river in one night to escape the Mozambique Co.'s pressgang, and later on, when perhaps they hear of the Boro Co. or the Luabo police being on the rounds gathering in labour for their factories, these poor people will cross again and remain so long as things are quiet. The men are warned to report for duty; should they not do so, they are arrested, put in irons, and forcibly taken. Should a man be absent when a

police raid is on, his wife is taken and their poor helpless little children left to fend for themselves, and no other people living near. Had my natives not have known of the children having been left there alone, they would have died of starvation. When I was travelling in the Nyasa Co.'s territory east of Lake Nyasa the same thing occurred, and I could not obtain porters there unless I went to the chief or some chief of a district. He sent out his police and simply arrested them, willy-nilly. Many of the natives were anxious to work for me voluntarily, but were afraid to leave their homes, as their wives and families would be taken in their absence, and they complained bitterly of how the women were treated in the lock-up at night.

"This was, I firmly believe, the cause of Mahua, the chief of the A tribe, rebelling against the Portuguese Government during the War. The women of his villages were impressed to grind meal for the troops and locked up every night. Police and soldiers, European and native, forced these women to their will. It was an absolute disgrace, and we hunters who knew the facts sympathised with Mahua, and one even felt inclined to give him assistance. I believe he is a refugee in British Nyasaland, and afraid to return. We people who know, know that if he did return his life would be made a hell.

"Then there is the abuse of the palmator. I have seen near Augoche, a Goanese official there order a police boy to punish a runaway native with the palmator and keep on until he was told to stop. The official went inside his house and sat down talking and drinking with his friend—I saw the native faint three times, and lying writhing on the ground, still being held and punished. The policeman on several occasions hitting him on the head and elbow trying to make him get up. The hands had burst and blood was streaming from them. The policeman had to leave off for a short rest on several occasions, but as soon as he thought that the official inside might come out he renewed the beating. I remonstrated with this official and he stormed at me, asking me how dare I insult the Portuguese Republic

by querying the order of the law, as spoken by him, who represented the Republic. This poor native was then put in the 'boots' (sabatos). The boots are logs of wood with a rectangular hole for the foot to pass through. A peg is then driven through, so that the foot cannot be withdrawn. There is one boot put on each foot, and may weigh anything up to 5 or 6 kilos each. In addition, perhaps four or five boys are chained together from neck to neck, with strands of wire. And in this way they are made to work. These dangerous (*sic*) criminals may do anything from one month to six months simply because they have not come in to work when called upon or having been forced have run away. I consider, Sir, that this state of affairs is a disgrace to humanity. It makes my blood boil even to think of it now, two years after I have seen it. In one district near Lake Nyasa I know of several planters, mostly Portuguese, and some English also, who have had to give up their plantations and move to another part because they could not obtain labour, not even by asking the chief of the district. I was told by some of these planters that the officials were impressing all the native labour for plantations that they were working for their own benefit. These plantations were ostensibly belonging to a *bona fide* planter, but who was in partnership with a Chefe de Concelhao or Chefe de Poste. And the planters said, what can one do, these officials get so poorly paid that they do anything to augment their income?

"But in my opinion there is something altogether very much wrong with the whole administration of justice as regards the relation of the European to the natives. I think and in fact feel sure that the higher officials do not know of the malpractices carried on by petty officials in the outlying districts. Chefe de Poste is in reality a small king in his own district, and outside the Mozambique Co.'s territory it seems to be a very poor type of men who are in these positions. There is no supervision whatever, and it is a very rare occurrence for any of the heads of districts like Quilimane, Tete, Antonio, Ennes, etc., to visit any of the

outlying posts. I am also sure that the Governor-General and the Governors of the various provinces would not tolerate such a state of affairs did they know. I must give credit to Mozambique Co. for the way in which they tried to develop their territory and for employing a more superior type of man and remunerating him better than any of the other companies in the districts under direct Government control. But a company is given a concession to grow sisal, tobacco, or sugar, and in all cases there is a clause in the agreement that so much labour must be supplied, and so the officials are forced, one might say, to impress labour. But why is it necessary? In all my travels in Southern Africa, viz. the Union of South Africa, Rhodesia, North and South, and the Nyasaland Protectorate, it is not necessary to force natives to go to work. Perhaps one hears of a man complaining of being short of voluntary labour, and it is often his own fault—he either is a bad payer or he expects too much, or some reason or other. And a bad name given to a employer, amongst the natives, travels far and gets exaggerated. There is something wrong with the whole system, of prazos especially; a better type of man is required and more strict supervision, and the salary must be enough to insure that the man has not got to try to make up for the smallness of it by any and all sorts of reprehensible methods. It seemed to me that some of the prazos holders simply took over the area for the purpose of hut-tax or poll-tax farming, and anyway, if they do go in for planting, the native is simply looked upon as to be used to the fullest extent and at the cheapest rate possible. His wishes are not considered in the least. He is virtually a slave to the company or prazos holder on whose land he resides. If he is called upon to work and he voluntarily (*sic*) goes he is paid what? Five or six escudos, which at the rate of exchange then (two years ago) was about the 25th part of a pound sterling. Certainly in the Mozambique Co.'s territory the pay is better and does meet the needs of the local native. But he is not his own master.

"Now, Sir, I am laying all this before you and can

substantiate and prove every word I have said. I can give you names of people concerned, places, and approximate dates, and I can call hundreds, yes thousands, of natives to corroborate my statements. I can also name Europeans to do the same, and one happened to be a high official in the Union of South Africa, who was camped at the same place in the Quilimane district near Augoche, where I mentioned about the abuse of the palmator that I witnessed. He did not witness the particular instance I mention, but he did witness others, and he next day struck camp and moved off or else I believe he would have laid violent hands on the official there (a Goanese). It is not for me to criticise the actions of the Portuguese Colonial Office, but I do think that some steps should be taken to appoint a better class of man. There were governors whom I have heard very highly spoken of, for example, Col. Macnaco, General Freira d'Andrade, and in 1923 when a change was being made in the High Commission Office, everyone hoped, both Portuguese and aliens, that General d'Andrade would be appointed. It requires someone who has the real welfare of the people, European and native, of the colony at heart, and Portuguese East Africa would then become a shining star on the flag of the Republic. As it is, the state of affairs is simply rotten to the very core."

(4) Extract from a letter dated 11/2/24: "Contractors acting as agents for the Angola Government . . . employed several hundreds of this indigenous labour which was impressed as required, and as men usually came in batches of a hundred they were constantly on the move.

"I was compelled to send ⅘ths of their pay to the Finance Department in Loanda. . . . There may be exceptions, but I feel convinced in my own mind from inquiries I made that the money either does not go from Loanda or that it gets no further than the administrator of the district.

"The total amount payable to these men, apart from food, is only 40 centavos per day, which at the

present rate of exchange approximates ¾d., and during the term of contract, usually six months, amounts to $57.60, or about 10s. at to-day's rate; on the basis of ⅕th being received on the men's departure it would mean that they actually receive 2s. in payment of six months' strenuous work, and the remaining 8s. most probably goes into the local administrator's hands.

"Another factor of importance is the entire lack of discrimination shown by the administrators when impressing labour. It is the fact that we have received men much too young for the strenuous work necessary, men much too old, lame men, sick men, consumptives, disease-ridden, and so on, but of course have been compelled to accept them because the Government insist.

"Another point also of interest; the contracts for these men are always for six months, and we had a contingent of men due to leave Loanda for Benguela in September last. When I returned to England in November these men were still awaiting repatriation, and six men had died within fourteen days[1] simply because they thought the Government had broken their pact and were refusing to repatriate them. The remainder absolutely refused to work. I heard subsequently that they had been sent home about the second week in November."

Portuguese treatment of natives is notoriously the worst in Africa: but the arguments by which it is defended rest on precisely the same premises as those which are appealed to in other East African communities in excuse for special treatment of natives.

[1] *Cf.* Nevinson, *A Modern Slavery*, which records a similar case of heart-break.

CHAPTER XVI

THE MISSIONARY PLEA

In civilised communities throughout Europe men intermix and have dealings with one another for reasons of innumerable variety. But the motives which chiefly bring white men into contact with coloured races are only two. One of the two is much more generally and conspicuously operative than the other. They are so essentially different, and the less conspicuous one is in itself so important, that it is instructive to compare and contrast them. White men go to uncivilised countries as missionaries, desiring to bring benefit to the natives, and they go desiring to benefit themselves by earning an income or acquiring property. We need not concern ourselves here to discuss the merits of the religions which the missionary sets out to preach, or their suitability to the mind of the savage: we need take account only of the incentive and the method of the intercourse. Essentially, penetration of uncivilised countries by missionary enterprise is actuated by goodwill towards the natives, and devoid of personal self-seeking, and its aim is educational; that is to say, it assumes that the negro has a spirit that can be quickened or at least an intelligence that can be stimulated through teaching, that is, by means of the reasonable presentation of truths or the persuasive inculcation of beliefs which will affect his desires and impulses and cause him to order his life in a manner not only conducive to his spiritual liberation and enlargement, but also more in conformity with European social standards. It is true that a great deal of missionary enterprise in the course of history has been far less sweetly reasonable in its methods than this. The great colonial expansion of Spain was inspired and promoted by proselytising faith as enthusiastically as it was by acquisitive greed:

the slave-trade was justified in the name of the world's Redeemer; and it would be a very great mistake to disregard such professions as hypocritical pretexts. It was Las Casas, a very able and pre-eminently humane and saintly man, that first advocated the transportation of negroes to work in the New World. He recommended it on behalf of the American natives, whose inferior physique was quickly succumbing to the exigencies of plantation work. He believed that negroes were strong enough both to work there and to thrive, that their life would be happier and less harassed than in their African homes, and that they would gain spiritual benefit by the privileges of contact with Christianity. He found these beliefs as completely illusory as were the similar theories of the philanthropists and ecclesiastics who blessed the foundation, in "the name of Almighty God," of the Congo Free State. Capitalist Imperialism, as I have already observed in referring to the history of the British South Africa Chartered Company, has its own essential functional laws, which it follows with ineluctable orthodoxy in its economic dealings with coloured peoples. It is not deflected by the enthusiasms of home-dwelling Imperial idealists. The missionary enterprise of Spain was conducted on the theory that conquest, annexation, and labour were well pleasing to God as a means of saving heathen souls. Its outcome was slavery both of body and mind. The Spanish missionaries themselves were characteristically missionary in their personal impulses: the application that was made of their theory of the duty of proselytism by the secular agencies of the community does not obscure that fact. Where, however, missionaries have not been supported by secular force, as was the case with modern missions, at least during the second colonial period, to savage tribes in Africa; where there has been nothing to tempt or to support secular invasion, the self-devotion of the missionary method has been more conspicuous.

It may not be impertinent to note that one characteristic of the third colonial period has been the political endowment of missions by assignments of land, which has given them an economic interest in their dealings with natives identical with that of the secular settlers. For example,

in Southern Rhodesia, such missionary grantees participate in that iniquity to which I have more than once referred of demanding rents from the natives resident on the lands assigned to them by the Government which has appropriated the country, just as the Chartered Company did, and as landowners who bought from it, and the Government of Rhodesia itself continue still to do. In other respects also some of the missionary bodies in Rhodesia and Kenya depend on standing well with the settlers' legislature to a degree which makes it difficult and injudicious for them to act and speak with the fearless independence which enabled the Free Churches in the West Indies to be the most effectual propagandists of liberty and education for negro slaves. The theory that the savage is an ignorant child, who must be disciplined for his own good, and that training in productive manual labour is the best education for him, has always flourished less where the power and the economic incentive to adopt that method of improving him have been absent.

When I was writing upon this topic twenty-three years ago, the policy of missionaries, of the school that aims at dealing with native negroes solely with a view to their own evolution and not for the profit of Europeans, had been showing some signs of taking a distinct form, divergent from its earlier faith in contact and intermixture, namely, that of advocating, in accordance with Sir Theophilus Shepstone's ideas, the entire exclusion of secular white influence from native territories and institutions. To maintain the tribal system, the native authorities, even native superstitions and customs abhorrent to many white men, but having a reasoned basis in the social conditions of African life, was a policy that was being advocated where it was still possible. It was only entirely possible where white men could be excluded from settlement and from the exploitation of minerals or other natural resources of the country. The problems under such conditions would cease—so far as such a territory was concerned—to be of "White Capital and Coloured Labour." Such missionaries as Bishop Weston of Zanzibar and the Rev. A. S. Cripps of Southern Rhodesia (author of *An Africa for Africans*) have been advocates of this policy, believing that the direct

virtue of Christianity did not need to be modified for the natives' digestion by emulsion with European secular economics. But such exclusiveness cannot be maintained in any country really suitable for white settlement. Enough has been said on this theme in Chapter XIII (Coloured Labour in South Africa).

The educative tutelage of the coloured man by the white, which is advocated by this section of the missionary school, would, of course, leave the native in that state of economic independence that is so inconvenient to capitalist enterprise. So far as any such policy is carried into effect, it co-operates in that tendency to defeat the capitalist system which I have pointed out as a native characteristic of the African temperament elsewhere. It excludes those persuasives of land monopoly and high taxation which the Commission on the Congo Free State (quoted above, Chapter IX) recognised as necessary to bring the African to school.

The theory that civilised races owe a duty to the uncivilised is no doubt held to-day by some people as a sincere moral conviction: though I myself have never encountered any secular thinker who held it in that undilutedly altruistic form. It seems to me to be a metaphysical projection or emanation of a much more precise and imperative religious doctrine. In its dogmatic Christian form it is cogent and concrete enough—"Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature." So far as the belief in either obligation is operative it produces and supports missions of various kinds. It is a truly humane and vital and valuable impulse. But it has never by itself induced any race to annex the territory of any other or assume its Government. It had, indeed, a shadowy and partial incarnation in the idea of Protectorates: but Protectorates have repeatedly been converted into possessions and colonies, or assigned, even more unhappily for their inhabitants, to white men's Dominion Governments. (The Native States whose constitutions survive as representations of that transient idea, which took shape just before the scramble for Africa developed, live to-day under the encroaching threat of incorporation into the South African Union.) It has assisted and served as a pretext (as in the Spanish Empire) where

there have been other inducements to the secular power, especially where the inducements were gold, precious stones, and metals, or produce having a high monopoly value, as spices and sugar at one time had. Failing these, it has never effectually operated to induce any white Power to "take up the White Man's Burden"; so that practically it must be recognised that it has been impotent as a colonising force, and that whoever appeals to it as a reason for advocating colonisation, or even the protectoral patronage of some "backward" country, must, if he is to hope to be heard, appeal to some more material attraction as well. Quite reasonably, for the assumption of control calls for money. It quickly becomes a business matter. If you wish to get money out of a business man you must show him a prospect of return. If he does not desire return, it is probable either that he is not a rich man, or that, if he is, he will not be prepared to spend very much. If he is prepared to sacrifice a great deal in order to bring the blessings of civilisation to the heathen without reward, he is probably rather the sort of man who will either become a missionary himself or will prefer to support missionary enterprise in missionary methods rather than through the secular extension of Empire.

We must accordingly recognise that the idea that white races impose or should impose their presence on coloured races from missionary motives is no more than a pious opinion. I have referred to it at this length, empty as it is, because we have heard much of it during recent years under the form of the idea of trusteeship. The truly effectual cause of secular interracial intercourse is, and always has been, economic motive: the manifestation, not of a duty of elevating backward races, but of the personal right or determination to live. No one has any justification for blaming the white man for following this impulse. The proposition that any race has a sacred right to exclude aliens from the advantages of the territory it occupies so long as those strangers conduct themselves inoffensively is indefensible. The right of exclusion is simply one of might and of domestic convenience. Unfortunately the experience which uncivilised tribes have had of immigrant white men seeking fortune has usually been such as to cause them now to

regard all whites as a source of danger. The inoffensive suffer accordingly. No one can reasonably assert that Europeans had not the right to settle in Africa, because at the time of their coming it was sparsely inhabited by savages of another race. The savage has no justification for killing the innocuous immigrant; and though it may be quite intelligible that he should now desire to do so we cannot blame the white settler for killing him first whenever he attempts it. Land monopoly has no more a divine sanction in savage than in civilised countries. It may be—it sometimes has been—by no means the fault of the white man if his coming brings bloodshed.

On the other hand, it is unquestionable that white colonisation, impelled by the economic motive, has frequently been marked by unscrupulous treasons and cruelties. These are not a necessity of the case, and therefore I do not labour them: I merely wish to call attention to the modern form of the old combination of proselytism and personal interest. The old form exemplified in the Spanish colonisation was: Annex and govern these regions, because by so doing you will bring the heathen under the ministrations of Holy Church, and, no matter what befalls their bodies, their souls will be saved by conversion and by the sacraments. We have heard echoes of this doctrine in our own time: for instance, when it was outspokenly argued by a South African Bishop that the indenturing of Chinese coolies for the Johannesburg mines would give them a similar chance, and when two of our East African Bishops gave their support to the policy of compulsory labour in Kenya; but for the most part the doctrine now takes a more secular form. It is propounded that the white man is a higher form of humanity and the white man's civilisation a nobler and better thing than the black man and his mode of social life; and that the industrial system of the white man, and not his learning or his literature, or even his religion, affords the best school for the black man's education. It is not uncommon for British philanthropists of this school to maintain that Islam is a better religion for Africans than Christianity. Neither Islam nor Evangelical Christianity, it may be observed, furnish any support for the proposition that the white son of God and his secular civilisation

are better than the black. There is this to be said in favour of Islam, that it remains far less sophisticated into subservience to economic materialism than official and conventional Christianity. Many missionaries, however, have not failed to dissent vehemently and continuously from the educational theories of this secularist school. They have indeed complained, very generally, that the contact of the civilised man, in pursuit of his own profit, with the coloured, has been largely demoralising. (The Secular School has not been slow to return the compliment and to allege that a native converted is a native spoiled.) The missionaries believe in giving the instruments of knowledge, in the form of reading, writing, and book learning, holding that the essentials of human civilisation are enshrined in its literatures and its religions, and that these are recorded by inspiration and scholarship, which it is the function of schools and universities to maintain and hand on. The Secular School derides the African scholar as a contemptible product, and advocates an education exclusively manual and technical.

Each school is doubtless justified in much of its criticism of the other; but the Missionary School has the cleaner hands and its theory is less tainted with motive. Unfortunately, the work of both is in its characteristic manner destructive of the form of society that has nurtured the African, and by this action must do what for the moment at least seems injury. For instance, if the native, under the teaching of Christianity, abandons polygamy, his social system is disturbed by the creation of a class of unattached women for which the economy of native tribal society affords no position. If he abandons his tribe to work for wages in the white centres of industry, not only is his contribution towards the support of his tribe's ineffectives withdrawn from it, but he forfeits that claim to support himself, and has the prospect of destitution before him in his old age. But if the missionary contact has failed to effect all it aimed at it has at any rate not furnished him with civilised vices. This the town-civilisation of mining centres abundantly does.

Those who despise the black man most are persons who have failed to get him to do for them something they

desired that he should do for their profit and who have injured and demoralised him in the attempt. Those who despise him least and who are most hopeful about his future, most confident that he can assimilate elements of progress from the white man, are those who have had to do with him in relations in which no desire to exploit his labour has intervened. If industry would be good for him, and if it is desirable that he should learn to be more industrious, the impulse must not come from self-interested pressure on the part of the would-be employer, or it will leave no permanent gain, save suspicion and estrangement between the races. It certainly does not leave the habit of industry. That can only be maintained by the stimulus of the worker's own quickened will.

CHAPTER XVII

EDUCATIONAL PROBLEMS

In the contact of white and coloured in the native lands of the latter the process of social fusion through interbreeding, which is of considerable significance and influence in some other parts of the world, does not seem likely, for a long time to come, to play any important part. That men of mixed European and African race are destined to be influential in advancing the solution of race problems both in the United States and the West Indies cannot be questioned. They are notably so already. The coloured people of South Africa have also a special and recognised position, and it is significant that in the programme recently formulated by General Hertzog for dealing with racial relations there it was proposed to remove from the coloured people (as distinct from the natives, presumed to be of pure African race) the legal disabilities to which they are still subject in Natal and the Orange River and Transvaal Provinces, but from which they have long been free in the Cape Province. In the United States, the West Indies, and the Cape Colony special social conditions both conduced to the original and derivative interbreeding and are favourable to the survival and nurture of offspring. Where the white has not possessed the black in slavery there has arisen no such considerable class of mixed blood, at any rate in British colonies, and the prejudice on the part of the white element against interbreeding has been originally stronger and tends to increase in strength. The relations of the Boers to the Bantu natives with whom they had to contend for the ownership of the lands they invaded and whom in considerable numbers they reduced to the position of bondsmen upon the land, but not of domestic slaves, were markedly different from those of their progenitors in the Cape Colony, where predial

and domestic slavery obtained, and since the Boers migrated there has been comparatively little interbreeding between the races. The prejudice against it among the Boer element in the population became and is very strong. Equally strong is the objection to it on behalf of the Bantu communities, so long as their racial coherence and tribal traditions survive. I have pointed out that where a hybrid class has come into being and has attained an honourable and organic position in a mixed community, it is, in fact, an advantageous element; and in South American States—for example, Brazil—the community is practically unaffected by any kind of discrimination on account of colour, and every man finds his place according to his abilities and his merits. But it is clear that such a class can hardly be expected to attain a happy position in any near future in those vast African dominions which white men have recently begun to attempt to colonise and exploit, such as Rhodesia, East Central Africa, Tanganyika, and Kenya. It is in these countries that white and black are or will be most distinctly confronted in the class division of employer and employee; and in such countries, in the comparative absence of any hybrid middle class, this confrontation seems likely, if once established, to persist most enduringly. The distinctions of race and of racial social habits which suggest and in part explain race antagonism will be the less subject to modification, and any bridging of the gulf must be effected the more exclusively by the operation of intellectual and spiritual sympathies. In the promotion of these even a small number of talented men of mixed race, if loyal to the best in both sides of their parentage, can do much to act as profitable interpreters and intermediaries.

The fusion of the white and black racial elements into an harmonious society is complicated in East Africa and Natal by the presence of a large Asiatic population of Indian immigrants. These outnumber the whites in Natal, Tanganyika, and Kenya: in Natal the majority of them are cultivators. The Indian immigrants in the West Indies who have settled in Trinidad, British Guiana, and Jamaica, are very intelligent cultivators, and are also capable managers of cattle and dairies. In these occupations they form a valuable element in the population. They also very largely

fill in these communities the position which in Jamaica and other West Indian islands is filled by people of mixed coloured race—that of traders, shopkeepers, and artisans. In these occupations it is complained that they drive a wedge between the civilisation of the white and that of the native, and prevent the native from rising into the ranks of skilled artisans.

Whatever radical and permanent incompatibilities may be deemed to exist between races, estimation of their importance is deeply prejudiced by the establishment of the relation of the employer and employee. That economic relation obscures and distorts apprehension of more deeply human relations. It does so in European countries where employer and employed are of the same race. This prejudice affects theories on the question of the black man's education as it does other judgments concerning him. It affects the judgment of the propertied and employing class in European communities with regard to the education suitable for the children of what are there called the working-classes and the capacity of those children for doing justice to it. All over the world, and not merely between white and black, there is invariably a tendency for the employing or would-be employing class to disparage and underestimate the capacity of the employed class for education; whilst at the same time there is a reluctance to give the working-class education, lest they should become too clever and get notions above their station. The idea that the native must be kept in his place, that he has a very definite place to be kept in, and that school education tends to make him come out of that place or to desire to come out of it, is universal throughout "white men's countries" in Africa, and certainly not only in Africa.

The African races generally have a keen dialectical faculty, and are, in some ways, quicker in apprehension than the average white man of North European stocks. They have a great belief in the efficiency of discussion to ascertain what is right, expedient, and lawful, and having intense regard for law, they are easily governed when dealt with lawfully and with justice. But they must be convinced by reason. This dialectical disposition and the African's natural gift of language are sometimes to be observed in

somewhat erratic exercise, owing to poverty of the material they may be employed on; in other words, the "educated," or rather the semi-sophisticated, negro is often a wind-bag; but wherever the African has to deal with the familiar material of his own personal interests, education does not leave him a wind-bag, but distinctly improves his capacity. He can assimilate what he sees a use for. I should think it more than doubtful whether the average West Indian negro, even after so long a period of contact with civilisation, is yet well qualified for complete democratic control of a constitution of Parliamentary reform directing, in a community of mixed race, the government of a State formed on the developed western model. I should certainly demur to it with respect to any African native community. But with respect to the matters which touch his daily life in the small community, the African, whether at home, or even in exile, after the great hiatus of slavery, shows abundant shrewdness and aptitude for the affairs of local government. With considerable experience of the political intelligence of agricultural voters in the South and South Midland counties of England and of the qualities of Jamaican negroes, I do not think there is much to choose between them in regard to qualifications as electors for Parliament. The technicalities of a civilised European State are at present out of the range of the West Indian negro's experience; much more so, of course, of the African's; but the meaning of taxation, the meaning of his "access" to land, the quality of his experience in his service with the white men are things he comes very easily to appreciate; and as soon as he becomes at all literate he proves a very acute interpreter of the contents of written contracts. In these respects, however much the fact may be obscured by his illiteracy, his alien language and other obstacles to a clear understanding of what is in his mind, the so-called savage of most African tribes, having had for generations to live by his intelligence or his cunning, has often a considerable start of the average white unskilled labourer of Europe with whom we tend to compare him. In regard to those ordinary questions of practical life about which country people, perplexed by the operations of lawyers and public officials, consult those whom they trust as magistrates or employers or friendly neighbours of the

privileged classes, West Indian negro peasants are quite as intelligent as the Anglo-Saxon rustic. The counsel of those who recommend that the black man in a mixed community should not be educated, lest he should become a danger, is idle. The most essential thing that white Governments have got to do in Africa is to teach their natives to understand the white man's language. That is a pretty big educational programme, and it is indispensable. But mere contact and intercourse with the white give a stimulus to the intelligence and will of the native, which sets him on the track of such knowledge as may be relevant to his practical needs; and from the lowest point of view it is safer for the white man that he should have the opportunity of getting this knowledge right end foremost.

The educational problem is not going to be solved by the panacea of manual instruction or technical training. It is pathetic to hear the obscurantist planter, the colonist who believes in keeping the negro in his place, relenting towards the missionary who sets up a technical school, and speaking quite tolerantly of him. The missionary has learnt much in the school of experience. He did not begin to teach his scholars trades for the benefit of the white employer, but because the colonial white man had made it difficult for him to teach the natives, for their own benefit, anything else, except perhaps the best thing of all—the belief in human character. The missionaries would have liked to have made their scholars Christians, and they have in many cases succeeded. They might have had more success had they had the field to themselves, as they had in the early days in the Bamangwato country. A wise native ruler like Khama may be quite capable of appreciating the superiority of Christianity to paganism as an instrument of the human spirit and of adopting it as his tribal religion with good results; not the least among which, for Khama, was the co-operation of white missionary influence in securing his lands from the fate of those of his neighbours the Mashonas and the Matabele. But the native does not believe in words and names, except as convenient instruments for a purpose; he believes in facts and forces (his religion is an elaborate technique for coping with supernatural powers), and he sees that the white men with whom

he has to do in the relations of fact and force are not Christians (in the sense in which the missionary of the Gospel has taught him about Christianity) either in doctrine or in practice. White secular contact and immigration, therefore, will not make the African Christian. They will tend to do so less and less, and will make the missionaries' task more and more difficult as the exploiting secular interest gains ground on the spiritual in the white man's contact with them. Whatever the white man's Juju may seem to be for the African (and it is plainly a good thing, full of astonishing powers), it evidently does not come out of Nazareth. The Bible of the missionaries, indeed, implants that dangerous ferment that made Lollardy and the villeins' revolt in England, the Hussites and peasant war in Germany, congregational and democratic Protestantism in France, and the rest of the Jacqueries, all beaten out by fire and sword and banishment so long as the privileged castes could fight that spirit in Europe, and now that it takes form in the independent native Churches, denounced and repressed to-day with the same weapons and on the same secular grounds. This kind of Christianity, the native, like his forerunner in Europe, can apprehend, and he is taught it is heresy. He will hardly accept high Anglicanism in its place; he is too rebellious and independent of spirit, too Protestant and Congregational for Roman Catholicism. But the missionary can and does teach him English and trades, and for these things he still thanks the missionary. And because he loves those that love him more easily and instinctively than the Caucasian, and because he trusts those whom he has come to know are honest and seek no self-interest in what they do or endeavour to do for him, the missionary may still for a long time to come have power and influence with him.

In considering the effects on the black of contact with the white, the character of his psychical constitution, especially the religious aspect, must be borne in mind. The African is more completely steeped or immersed in religion —and subservient to its formulations or superstitions—than the average European that confronts him. He is excessively an "introvert"; the European, comparatively, very much an "extravert." Whereas we live habitually in the sensible

and rational world, and only by an effort and half-sceptically take cognisance even of what we recognise as subconscious parts of our nature having positive existence and activity, the African rarely, if ever, thinks of anything as having merely sensible or material existence.

Everything for him is body or spirit, himself included; and the fact that the bodily existence is only one side of existence for him partly accounts for his indifference for human life. Human sacrifices, cannibalism, and other ceremonial barbarities among the pagan tribes, the recklessness of death at the chief's command in the military tribe, are all bound up with this outlook on life and with the chief's position as the responsible representative and interpreter of the spiritual powers. The subconscious, subliminal, part of the influences and forces that we discern in the human mind bears a much greater proportion to the conscious and rational part in the African than in the civilised European. This is not only to say that he is more emotional, which he is, in good senses as well as in bad, or that he is more the child of passion; he is in some respects less so; in some more; it means that a greater proportion of what enters into his consciousness is fluid and plastic to the formulating imagination.

The pressure and exigencies of evolution in civilised life have not furnished him with that great and elaborate superstructure of popular science, habits, and formulas that engages most of our own attention and consciousness, so engrossing it for the most part that we have almost come to ignore the existence of anything outside or beneath it. The African, like the psychic medium, has his consciousness more open to what is beneath this superficial raft of established means of survival in the quotidian consciousness, and, like the medium, he formulates as real existences in definite shapes the impressions that come to him out of the vague depths of life. I wrote this, the foregoing, twenty-five years ago, and as I rewrite it I find the same truth very interestingly restated by Mr Aldous Huxley in his essay on "Varieties of Intelligence" (*Proper Studies*, 1927):

> "The primitive, in the fabrication of his traps and weapons, his boats, his utensils, his houses, is as care-

fully objective as any western engineer. His arms are the best he can make, his canoes the most perfect that his means and knowledge permit him to build. But if he misses with the first few shots, if he has an accident on his first journey, he will bury the blowpipe that has taken him weeks to make, he will never use his canoe again. They are inhabited by bad luck. The extravert material world has become interpreted in terms of an introverted world view. Thus we see that the primitive will pay the most scrupulous attention to outside objects, will treat them, up to a point, in a completely materialistic and scientific spirit. But if anything unexpected takes place in connection with the objects, anything which he finds disagreeable or not immediately explicable, he reverts at once to the subjective, animistic interpretation of the world current in his society. Things which he had treated materialistically become the home of dangerous and personal powers which must either be propitiated or simply avoided."

This fetichism is the exaggerated operation of his constant habit of mind, on which all the sanctions of his life, all his conceptions of what it is necessary to do, are founded. The witch doctor is the interpreter of these imagined powers. The power of the subconscious is not in fact wholly imaginary, no more so with the European than with the African, but with the former the frontiers of exploration are further advanced. How far the African's consciousness really penetrates deeper than the civilised man's into the abysses of his own temperament it is impossible to conjecture: in some respects it probably does so, as is the case with most introverts, as compared with extraverts, in civilised society. All one can say is that whilst within the narrow bounds of his rational and practical world he is markedly and even grossly practical, he is at the same time more regardful of the unformulated powers of life and less under the dominion of the formulated, except in so far as they have been invested with authority by his religious system. Hence, also, his comparative inaccessibility to what the white man considers to be rational economic

motive, and his consequent instability as a wage-worker. Hence his capacity for quick adaptation to the forms of the white man's religion and rhetoric; hence, too, the comparative shallowness of their real hold upon him. Hence his quickness and direct apprehension in many respects, and his appreciation of the emotional and democratic elements of evangelical Christianity. Taking into account with this fluid mass of temperament the great bodily vigour of the African, his efficient digestion, his reproductive vitality, and his comparative intractability to anything except actual compulsion in the attempts of the white man to make him work for his profit against his own inclination and recognition of advantage to himself, it must, I think, appear difficult to imagine that he is not likely to have a good deal of his own way in the future of his industrial development. There is certainly a good deal of ground for conceiving that that may not be the way of capitalist industrial civilisation, as we have seen it in our own countries, no matter how exclusively this may appear to its exponents and agents the only conceivable school of human progress.

The time has gone by when the coloured races could be dealt with entirely by force. Political South Africa at this moment appears disposed to try that experiment. But absolute disciplinary domination will not be tolerated by that world sentiment which, with intermittent reactionary interruptions, finally leads and determines history in such matters than chattel slavery would be. Even into the carefully secluded hell of the Congo Free State humane opinion did effectually penetrate. In the principal sphere of the problems of the relations of white capital and coloured labour the solution of difficulties by extermination of the original natives, which has been practically effected in Australia and North America, is unthinkable.[1] The creation of solitudes, as in the Congo State and Angora, where once there were populous villages, along certain trade routes, by the fear of the white man and of his carriers and labour "recruiters," could only be a temporary phenomenon. Pushed too far, it destroyed the profit of trading, and through that fact alone it led to a demand for reform. Even if the white

[1] Though Mr Elliott, before the South African Select Committee on General Hertzog's Native Bills, did say it seemed to him the only solution.

man were in a position to kill out the native African, as he killed out native Americans, which he is not, either physically or morally, the fundamental assumption of all our approach to this question is that he wants the black man's labour, and so must preserve him alive. This assumption granted, it is as certain that the position of the black man in any State where he mixes with the white must progress more and more towards equality, as it was that such progress should be made between the descendants of the conquered Saxons and Britons.

Congenial as is to many minds the doctrine that the black man, or at any rate the uncivilised native African, is a "child," and must be dealt with as such, it must inevitably break down before the natural reactions and rebellions of the human will. Such a theory always blindly ignores all that content of the black man's consciousness which is not obvious from its own point of view. It ignores the fact that the mind of the native is, as I have expressed it above, a full cup, and gives its own account of whatever comes into it. The truth is that the secular white man does not come to the black, treating him or proposing to treat him as a child: except when he proposes to whip him, and demands that he should obey.[1] He either comes to him setting up an industrial relation, and calling for him as a labourer, or setting up a State and calling on him for forced labour and taxes. There is nothing in either of these relations recognisable by the native as analogous to the relations between parent and child, teacher and scholar. He knows all about labour and taxes: they are affairs of grown men. There is nothing recondite or demanding high political erudition in the attitude adopted by Hampden about ship money, or in the views of an African native about hut-tax and poll-tax. A civilisation of European type is not necessary for the discovery of the doctrine that taxation should imply representation any more than there is for appreciating the fact that the strong like to make the weak work for them.

The white employer does not want the black man in the

[1] I have repeatedly read, or heard it argued, that because children are whipped, and the "native" is a "child," it is right to flog natives for disobedience or "impudence" to their employers or other white men.

capacity of a child at all: he wants him as a powerful and obedient muscular engine with as much adult intelligence as possible in apprehending and executing his, the white man's, purposes. The native understands that relation quite well. It is the relation of master and servant: not that of parent and child or teacher and scholar. An employer of that special kind of temperament to which I have alluded as capable of getting good work out of natives will no doubt make something more of it: and some employers may really desire, as does the missionary, to train the African for the purposes of his own life. Manifestly, however, in general that is not the purpose for which the European employs him, and the native knows it is not. He does not believe that disciplinary floggings, the insistence on punctuality and a fair day's task, and on the work being properly done, are intended for his own educational benefit. He is thinking and discussing with his friends all the time what on earth can be the sense of it all: he recognises that the white man gets advantage out of it, but the last thing he is predisposed to believe or recognise is that it is of educational and uplifting benefit for himself.

"It is here," wrote Bishop Frank Weston of Zanzibar, "that the foreign settler has done so much harm to Africa. While bent on making the African till his farm for him, he holds up to the African in his personal habits the false ideal of a man whose only work is making others work on his behalf. He rightly aims at leading Africans to be industrious: yet in the nature of the case he shows them that the higher a man rises the less manual work he does. Thus the African who thinks aims at being an overseer, or, better still, a clerk or a teacher: manual labour is for those who are uneducated.

"The Government must encourage Africans to remain on the land—that is, it must work out a policy of small farms, with the reservation that the soil remains common property. . . . Small holdings as an ideal do not enter into the African's mind."

Encouraging Africans to remain on the land is the precise negative of what has been hitherto the dominant policy in Kenya. There everyone from Governors downwards is constantly thinking and talking about how to make the native "come out of the reserves and work": and

when they talk about education for the native they are more and more coming to advocate a policy of refusing the native what he knows Europeans themselves mean by education—beginning with the teaching of how to speak, read, and write English. The tendency of educational theory for natives is to restrict it to a discipline in manual tasks conducive to the prosperity and convenience of the European.

I can never hear this doctrine, that the black man is a child and must be treated as such, propounded by Colonial dogmatists, without seeing in my inward vision the pleasant shining smile of a black face and hearing in my inward ear a soft-spoken humorous voice inquiring why, if Buckra believes the black man thinks like a pickney, and the Lord Jesus says except all we be converted and become like little children we cannot enter the Kingdom, the white man makes all so much trouble to teach the black man how not to be a child any more? The white man has a good answer to that, but he will not be able to convince the black man that he is educating him, as he educates his own children, by making him work for his profit, Mr Squeers' pedagogic prescription "W.I.N.D.E.R.—winder—now go and clean it"—notwithstanding.

The argument about the rights of the natives in regard to the fiscal exactions of the white man's government has nothing to do with the question whether the person from whom taxes are demanded or labour is called for is fit for political power in a civilised state or not, or is employing his time in a manner which commends itself to the moralists of the European community; it raises in a perfectly simple and elementary form the question that any man will ask of any other who comes and demands money from him: "What for? If I am to pay you money, what am I to get for it and how am I to know that I get it? If I am to work for you, what are you going to give me in exchange that I value?" The black man needs no European education to prompt him to ask these questions, nor, when he is told that the demand is to provide for the Government that fosters him, does he need any political agitation to prompt him to ask where the fostering is exhibited. Imprisoning and exiling a Harry Thuku because he voices these questions is not going

to interrupt the persistent discussion of them by Kenya natives among themselves: and repression can only conduce to perverse conclusions. Where results for the native benefit are shown, he, on his side, shows himself quite capable of appreciating them; but where the operations of the State exhibit themselves chiefly in limiting his access to land and putting fiscal pressure upon him to work for the white man, taxing him for purposes that are of no advantage to him, or only of advantage to him in the sense that they may, as they generally do, enable the white man to offer him wage employment, he is equally capable of showing an invincible incapacity to follow the white man's logic. He will not believe that these things are done for his benefit. Under such circumstances, if you want his money or his labour, you have to take it by force or by the knowledge that you will use force if it is refused. And if the black man thinks, as Wat Tyler did about the poll-tax, and as Hampden about the ship money, that he can put up a good fight on the issue, we must not be surprised if he tries it. There is in regard to such questions none of that mystery of the native mind about which we are so often admonished.

CHAPTER XVIII

INFLUENCES OF THE WHITE ON THE BLACK

THE European is to the African a force whose significance he cannot ignore. However courageous the black man may be, the white is to him what is expressed by the Greek word "deinos," a creature ingeniously terrible, and he is more. He can command the black man, win his confidence, his loyalty and affection; because at his best he has in him, more fully realised and emancipated from ignorance, superstitions and terrors, human qualities which the black man prizes in himself and whose virtue he appreciates as necessary to his own self-realisation. The black man by no means loves the white man *qua* white man; seldom, perhaps, even the individual white man as a person; rather he endures him as a visitation of God; but the genius, faculties, and deeds of the white man fascinate and impress him, not only as manifestations of power, or because they are helpful to him, but because they quicken in him a latent confidence that he can imitate, acquire, and exercise the same. That this emulation, in the partially educated coloured man and woman, sometimes shows itself in grotesque manners, of monkey-fashions of costume and behaviour, of aspirations to a creamy sallowness of complexion, extending to the use of lilac pearl powder on a sable skin for Sunday church-going, and the like, should not be allowed to obscure the fact that the stimulus and aspiration are real, and that through this indirect mode of stimulus alone is there much prospect of the white man contributing to the improvement of the coloured. Where his economic interests conflict with those of natives he improves them off the face of the earth. There can be in such circumstances no good Indians except dead Indians. Where there is no such direct competition, his commerce has constantly destroyed and

demoralised them, his demand for their labour broken up their tribal systems and converted them into a landless proletariat. One cannot but be impressed, in the West Indies, where the white man has had the coloured man so long in industrial tutelage by the comparative insignificance of what the latter has learnt industrially from the former; and this impression is one of the provocatives to despondency as to the outlook in some of those communities. The most conspicuous fact in regard to productive industry in these Colonies that emerges from a survey of their history during the last hundred years is that compulsion or pressure upon the negro to work for white employers on their estates not only consistently failed to make the negro industrious, but impaired his disposition to be so; and, further, that after slavery was abolished the substitution of the capitalist system of wage employment equally failed in the same manner. Yet in many respects the negro in these communities and in the United States, where the same industrial criticism is applicable, has learnt and acquired a very great deal. Only, it seems, he has not learnt the things that the white man tried to teach him and did temporarily teach him for his, the employer's, advantage. He learns and will learn the things that would seem to be for his own advantage.

Most important in regard to black men's territories in West Africa is the enormous experiment taken in hand in the Protectorates of Nigeria, and the hinterlands of the Gold Coast and Sierra Leone, where the native is left in possession of his land, and British administration aims only at establishing peace, justice, and safety of access and passage. So far as the white man has any direct industrial aim in these territories it must, at any rate for a long time to come, be limited chiefly to attempts to induce the native to grow the products he wants, and to assist him to improve his agricultural processes with this object. That the white element will, in other respects, form an effectual progressive leaven in so vast a population is hardly to be expected. The mining and timber-winning industries cannot contribute much to the social civilisation of natives. Their labour is supplied under contracts of limited duration, and its personnel is continually changing.

Men can only reap what they sow. To imagine that

those who put themselves into contact with uncivilised races with a view to their own economic profit are bound by so doing morally to improve those savages is the most simple-minded of self-complacencies. The next step in the argument always is that, because you are mentally elevating and civilising the native by such contact, you are entitled in bodily matters to coerce him, to punish him for disobedience. If you persist in this deluded course of conduct, one day you are "treacherously" shot by the native, and you have to "give him a lesson." Or you find the natives are dying out under your treatment, and then you speak of a mysterious law of Nature. The causes of the extinction of native races are only a mystery at a distance. On the spot they are easily recognisable as violence and starvation and civilised drinks and diseases. Extermination, in fact, is the only way, on that road, to get out of your difficulties.

On the countries where the white man has, with whatever philanthropic excuse or pretext, enslaved or used the black for his own economic profit, a curse still rests—on the West Indies, on the Southern States of America. They are sad lands. The exacted harvest has been reaped and carried: the fortunes are spent; the industrial system has perished. Only in so far as the contact was not altogether one of economic self-seeking, only because of human recognition and human influence between the races, has there been any permanent gain. Where colour prejudice rules, where human identity is most passionately disowned, whether it be in the White Republic or in the Black, there the prospect of the emergence of a wholesome society is least hopeful; where prejudice has died down, and men take rank on their merits, there the community shows most promise.

Fortunately, as there is no such thing as the pure "economic man" of politico-economic hypothesis, so there is no European nation that is purely economic in its contact with natives. If it is the greedy or enterprising adventurers of a nation that come into contact with coloured races, their ultimate support rests upon public opinion at home. I have pointed out how, in the British West Indies Colonies, after the emancipation of the slaves, the system of Crown

Government acted as a safeguard to the black against misgovernment by the employing class. And the contact between the races has never been only as between employer and employed: there has always been the missionary class, whose attitude, however unenlightened its dogmas, has ever been that of a spiritual brotherhood, and which, with whatever follies of method, has fought unweariedly for the principles of education and enlightenment; and there has generally been the administrative class, also, in motive, largely missionary, or, if doing its work more from public spirit and executive ambition than from sympathetic philanthropy towards the governed, at any rate free from any interest in their exploitation. Where this class is corrupt and cruel the situation is truly desperate. And, finally, the white man who goes out to mix with the coloured in commercial and industrial relations, subdued though his hand may be to what he works in, has human contact at many points with the native, and influences and is influenced by him through them. I have remarked that the power of getting work out of negroes is almost entirely a matter of the personal qualities of the employer or overseer, and that the relation of master and slave in these colonies and in the United States before emancipation was one in which personal relations had a far more important place than they have in the relations between the average civilised employer and his hired hand. This was one of the redeeming features of slavery, and this, not the industrial training or discipline which it might have given, but which has left so little result, was the means of its contribution to that progress which the transplanted African unquestionably has made in the lands he now inhabits. And with regard to that divergence from civilised standards, in regard to ceremonial marriage, which is, perhaps, the greatest cause of scandal and headshaking to the American or English tourist visitor to the West Indies, it must be remembered that the white man not only destroyed the African's custom of marriage, and forbade the marriage of slaves, but sedulously, by precept and example, educated him in the looser relations to which he is now addicted.

CHAPTER XIX

KENYA

Mrs M. A. Buxton, a Kenya resident, in the introductory chapter of her recently published book, *Kenya Days*, puts very clearly the issue there recognised as to native labour policy, thus:—

> "The settlers argue that it is to the natives' advantage to come out to work on European farms, since they gain thereby in training and outlook from contact with western ideas: they become prosperous on earned wages, their health improves on their assured and varied diet, they are medically treated when sick. Furthermore, they maintain that the country owes its present degree of prosperity to the efforts of private individuals encouraged, even invited by the Colonial Office in the first instance, to take up land: pioneers who put their lives and their capital, whether of pounds, shillings, or pence, into the development of the country, and who now look to reaping their reward of prosperous estates to bequeath to their children and children's children.
>
> "On the other hand, the natives' attitude seems to be that work, *qua* work, does not appeal to them in the least, though as a means of earning money, which can then be spent in the reserves on cattle and wives, there is something to be said for it.
>
> "Their lives centre in the reserves, in their family property, in their local concerns; for the rest of the world they care not a jot. Some of them are keen on education, partly as children clamour for a new toy, partly because of the prestige it gives them among their neighbours, and partly also because they see how

comparatively wealthy all Europeans are, and they feel vaguely that with education such wealth will be within their reach. The development of the colony does not interest them at all, while the fortunes and vaunted enterprise of European settlers leave them cold.

"It is a problem the solution of which is not only debated day in and day out by the settlers, but in its close alliance with the native policy of the country is of very vital concern to those who govern. An adequate labour supply is essential to the development of our economic resources; at the same time, can the native be made to work if he does not want to?"

I interrupt Mrs Buxton to call attention to her ostensible acceptance here of the fundamental Imperialist postulate that "The Development of Our Economic Resources" is the primary duty of Europeans in Africa: also to the illuminating and suggestive character of her observation that "our economic resources" cannot be developed without a "labour supply," which it is assumed, as a matter of course, must be "native." I should be quite prepared to believe that Mrs Buxton herself is here using words with some irony and reservation, borrowing them from less intelligent fellow colonists. For the sentence concisely and pregnantly begs the whole question involved in the theory of capitalist economics and capitalist property. If these are "*our* economic resources" we are fully at liberty to develop them with our own labour. Beyond question there is at present plenty of room in that country for self-supporting immigrants, whether European or Asiatic, without any necessity for interfering with natives at all. Why then do "we" not do our own work? Is it because we cannot? In that case our effective seisin of these "resources" is incomplete, or indeed, perhaps, entirely non-existent. They are not, for us, "resources"—they are entirely valueless unless they can be "developed" by "labour." The capacity to do the indispensable labour is, it is assumed by the Europeans themselves, and may for the purposes of this argument be conceded to them, an ability peculiar to the native. By its exercise, and by that alone, can the natural ingredients and potentialities—inorganic or organic, vegetable, animal,

or mineral—of the African soil be endowed with the character of "resources." Without it the country is merely agreeable landscape or hunting ground æsthetically enjoyable or residentially desirable, like a park or a garden city, by those whose independent incomes allow them the privilege of frequenting it, and not even, perhaps, without native assistance enjoyable as a big-game hunting ground or shooting estate.

On the other hand, if it is native labour alone that can convert these potentialities into wealth, then surely it is the power of native labour that constitutes them "resources," and they might with equal or even greater propriety be spoken of as the natives' resources instead of as "ours." The truth, of course, is that they are to a great extent only "resources" when the knowledge of Europeans is combined with the labour of Africans: and the real question is, what is the equitable division of interest in those resources if they are to be exploited in that combination? The theory of capitalist economics and capitalist property disposes of this question very simply. It presupposes that, as is already the case in developed European capitalist societies, the land and all its potential resources belong to the capitalist and the employer, whether the two are combined in one person or divided into landowners or stockholders. The labourer's equitable interest in the results of combined exploitation is limited to the lowest wage at which he can be induced to work: all the rest belongs to the capitalist and the employer, by virtue of his property in soil and stock. In applying the capitalist system to Africa, European Governments, including our own, in East Africa, took care to lay the foundations of the capitalist economy they expressly desired to establish by boldly declaring themselves or successfully appealing to their Courts of Law to declare them the owners and proprietors of the land. Hence it is quite natural and logical that Mrs Buxton should speak, with her fellow settlers, of the potential resources of Kenya as "*our* economic resources." Now, the Socialist movement in Europe, represented by the Labour Party in England, repudiates this postulate as to property in economic resources, and is engaged in the deliberate enterprise of superseding the capitalist system which rests on it. The

capitalist point of view is equally uncongenial to the industrially unsophisticated African's mind which judges it quite simply for what it is, namely, an exercise of mere advantage of power, submitting to it fatalistically in various degrees of servitude, whether it is exercised by its own local landlords—such as those set up in Uganda by Sir H. H. Johnstone's ill-advised land settlement there, or by Europeans claiming titles of European character through grants by European Powers that have declared themselves to be the owners of all African land. But these ideas of property, and of the equities of participation in the resources of property developed by knowledge and labour which belong with them, are as foreign to the African mind as they are to that of the Socialist: and the African has never been trained to accept them by being born into a community whose landlords by Statutes of Merton and Acts of Enclosure constituted themselves the legal owners of everything the land could produce, except the workers' living wages. This brief digression will help to explain how it is that the Socialist and Labour Parties of Europe are in alliance with the African native world against the policy which has been so conspicuously developed in Africa during the last forty years of Imperial expansion.

I now resume my quotation from Mrs Buxton:

> "The West African policy would be to train the natives to develop their own lands profitably, while the conditions of life are gradually improved by better housing, medical services, and education of the right kind. Tribal organisations and the authority of chief and native councils would be upheld and guided by the European officials administering the districts in accordance with the ideas conceived at headquarters. Kenya, however, cannot always follow in West African footsteps, because in Kenya white settlement is an accomplished fact, and the settlers' interests may very easily clash with those of the natives. *It stands to reason that the more prosperous and contented is the population of a reserve, the less the need or inclination of the young men of the tribe to go out into the labour field.* From the farmer's point of view, the ideal reserve is

a convenient recruiting ground for labour—a place from which the able-bodied go out to work, returning occasionally to rest and beget the next generation of labourers.

"There may be a golden mean, yet undiscovered, which will reconcile these widely differing points of view; but whether there is or not, there is a growing feeling in the land that it is high time Government made some definite announcement of policy and carried it out."

Well—the Government is not without guidance—at any rate, if the "prosperity and contentment of the population of a reserve" may properly be regarded as a "native interest" of the kind which the British Secretary of State has declared is to be the Government's paramount aim. I myself, for reasons which I shall explain later, have never felt quite comfortable about the form of that outspoken pronouncement. The policy of the Government of Kenya has never been conducted upon that principle: I doubt if it can be and I am not prepared to say that it should be. It seems to me that the form of the proposition is not quite well suited to the circumstances of a mixed community. What should be aimed at in these is equality of privilege and consideration. I see no reason why in a happily mixed community the interest of one part of the population should be deemed paramount over those of others. No one nowadays would say that in the West Indies the interests of the black and coloured people should be paramount over the white any more than they would now endorse the once prevailing doctrine that the interests of the white must be paramount over those of the coloured.

As to the policy hitherto of the Kenya Government, a final extract from Mrs Buxton's book may serve as a text. Speaking of the Wakamba tribe, she says:

"The population is something like 288,000 people. Though they are indolent in their reserve, the Wakamba are good workers, fairly intelligent, and of rather a mechanical turn of mind. Normally about 15 per cent. of the adult males go out to work, and in hut- and poll-tax the tribe contribute round about £70,000 a

year to the revenue of the colony. In return, they get peace from raiding neighbours, administration by half a dozen European officials, a school, and a hospital."

The price seems fairly stiff, seeing that the officials, the school, and the hospital can hardly cost a tenth of the money. Moreover, in a population of 288,000, according to the average given in official reports on labour, there can hardly be more than 57,000 able-bodied adult males: so that the average tax per adult male would appear to be about 25s. Now, we have been told by a recent Report on the local Labour question that the average value of native production in the reserves does not exceed more than from 70s. to 90s. per annum, per family, of which not more than thirty shillings' worth is saleable produce. The Wakamba are not one of the most efficient agricultural tribes, so we may surmise that their annual product is nearer the lower level of value. Either, therefore, each family has to pay taxes at the rate of about a third of its income, or, if the taxation is earned by the men who go out to work, each would have to contribute on an average about 13s. 8d. per month. Elsewhere Mrs Buxton tells us their money wages (they get rations as well) are 12s. a month on liberally managed estates. I do not vouch for the accuracy of these figures: but they are all taken either from Mrs Buxton's book or from reports drawn up by representatives of the white planting community, who use them as an argument to show how much better it is for the natives to work on the estates than in the reserves. To an intelligence less ingenuously self-centred the figures seem rather to indicate that the Wakamba are oppressively overtaxed, and that by far the greater part of their taxation goes to support the economy of the white community. This, indeed, was expressly admitted in the Report of Mr Ormsby-Gore's East African Commission, which also stated that the principal reason why natives leave the reserves is in order to earn their taxes. When the writer and other critics of administration, accustomed to diagnose the significance of statistics and having adequate knowledge of the normal life of agricultural Africans, point out these facts, we are

frequently assured that we know nothing about the colony and that the settlers are gallant and humane English gentlemen. So, no doubt, many of them are. That is why I always prefer to quote from statements made by or on behalf of African settlers themselves and to leave readers to judge whether the situations thus presented are creditable to British administration and likely to either improve the natives subjected to them or to endear the white man's rule to them.

From the opening of Kenya for settlement until now the policy of the Government in dealing with natives has been guided preponderantly by the doctrine that their civilisation must be effected by inducing them to work on white men's estates. This statement is incontestable: the history is on record in Blue Books and White Papers, and part of it will be summarised in the following chapter of this book. It is idle for friends of Kenya settlers to lose their tempers, as they are apt to do, and to scold at those who bring this fact to the notice of the home-dwelling public as enemies of their own countrymen. The policy has been supported with a considerable deal of vehemence by many of the leading settlers, and it is concurred in by many more, some of whom no doubt have convinced themselves that it is the best policy for the native. But nothing is more striking to anyone who has had long contact with African native questions and personal familiarity with the point of view of African labourers than the complacent superficiality of some apologists in this country who claim to speak as friends of the settlers, and the tone of whose opinions is much on a level with those of middle-class women in England who write to the papers complaining about their servants.

The choice does not lie, as Mrs Buxton suggests, between a "West African" policy and the policy of compelling the natives to work: it lies between the entirely un-English assumption that an African villager is a peculiar kind of human being with whom a British Government has the right to deal as it would not think of dealing with white men, and the policy which has been consistently pursued with success in our older mixed communities, in which white men have formed the leading and dominant class and the workers have been negroes—emancipated slaves and their offspring.

Mrs Buxton hits the right nail on the head when she says that work, *qua* work, does not appeal to the African in the least, except as a means of earning money. The pious axiom that unless the native is prepared to do a reasonable amount of work on his own account, it is his moral duty to go out to work either for the Government or for private employers in wage employment, which has been gravely uttered by Governors in Kenya and even by an Under Secretary of State, is a special moral dogma invented entirely for the benefit of the white East African employing communities. Its self-deluding hypocrisy, it may safely be said, is as obvious to any African native as it would be to any English worker. The descendants of African slaves and Africans themselves have in practice been civilised, in so far as they have been civilised through the assistance of Europeans, by the help of men and women who understood them because they dealt with them on the assumption that they were human beings endowed with a human intelligence and a human spirit, and amenable to the ordinary economic and rational motives which would appeal to white men *in similar circumstances*. If the appeal seems to fail it is because the consideration offered is not appropriate or the circumstances not understood. The West Indian white employers did not succeed in civilising their Africans or making them industrious, far less in inducing them to recognise a "duty" to work by keeping them under pressure. The Jamaica peasantry to-day are a people of a very respectable level of peasant civilisation: that has been brought about by education (and education and the diffusion of the English language are the primary requirements in Kenya) and by assisting them to develop their own agriculture on their own land. That process has been carried out by the methods which I set forth fully in Chapter XXVI (The Pilgrimage of a Negro Peasantry). The improvement of the prosperity of the African in his own homesteads by those means automatically produces a willing labour supply. The present Kenya system of pressing a high proportion of the able-bodied men to come away from their homes for long periods continually maintains and stimulates in their minds that attitude which for so long was an obstacle to good feeling in the West Indies, namely, that the white man uses

his power and that of his Government to take advantage of them. Quite apart from this reaction on social feeling it is demoralising to the men to be taken for long periods far from their homes. It demoralises the women with whom they consort in their absence from home: it demoralises and places increased hardship and difficulty upon the women who remain behind in the reserves. The only sane policy for such a mixed community is that there should be constant and resolute educational effort on the part of the Government to assist the native to grow on his own roots as it is congenial to him to grow. The wages and conditions which good employers can offer him will always be sufficient to attract a reasonable supply of labour. Unfortunately, Kenya has been settled by white men much too quickly, its capitalisation has largely outrun the possibilities of an adequate labour supply. That is unfortunate for the settlers; but however deserving of sympathy in their difficulties they may be, those difficulties afford no justification for imposing compulsion upon the natives or for shunning the energetic pursuit of the development of a sound policy from the point of view of the interests of the natives in accordance with the promise of the British Government made in the Kenya White Paper of 1923.

Owing to the feverish haste with which the Government has appropriated and alienated to Europeans all the land deemed available for their occupation, and has promoted the immigration of settlers to occupy it, there has been in Kenya a peculiarly sudden and close confrontation between the two systems of civilisation represented and a more resolute and persistent policy pursued of pressing the European idea of development. Almost everywhere else the contact and interpenetration have been more gradual. The only parallel that readily occurs to mind of so stringent a confrontation of the two economic systems was exhibited in the German African Colonies, the development of which by the efficiencies of white civilisation, railways, roads, water-supplies, and scientific research, upon a basis of white planting settlement employing native labour, was conceived on the same fundamental assumptions of what was good for both parties as have predominated in the settlement of Kenya. The Germans, indeed, characteristically applied the

principles of those assumptions with still more confidence and thoroughness. In regard to the Namaqua Hottentots they had the courage of the convictions which Sir Charles Eliot expressed about the Masai, that they were a pest, and did their best to exterminate them by force of arms. The Kenya Government only ousted the Masai from their pasture lands and caused the death of many thousands of their cattle and a loss of human life described by a local magistrate as "very heavy." While the British used commandeered native labour for railways, road, public works, and porterage with some moderation, and paid some wages, the Germans used it, unpaid, with far more energy to get those benefits to the country quickly established. Where the British used the indirect force of taxation and the admonition of chiefs to press labour on to the white estates, the Germans pressed it directly; where the British Government talked liberally of scientific research, the Germans established the finely equipped institute at Amani.

The Government of Kenya has not, indeed, adopted the policy which was advocated by some of the earlier settlers of directly compelling natives to work by depriving them of their land, or by so restricting their reserves as to be insufficient for their maintenance (the present Governor, Sir Edward Grigg, has repeatedly stated that the reserves are amply sufficient), but it has been their policy to put pressure on them to do so by taxation and, as will be presently shown, by other compulsion. The philosophy of pressure by taxation is well explained by Dr Schantz, of the American Institute of Plant Breeding, in his chapter in the *Phelps-Stokes Educational Commissioners' Report*:

> "Taxation demands a money crop. All European Governments in South and East Africa levy a head- or hut-tax on the natives. This tax often imposes a heavy responsibility on the native. There were other administration taxes—poll-tax, permits, dog-tax, etc. The 16,000,000 natives of East Africa contribute about 3s. per person, including women and children. Tanganyika, Nyasaland, and Portuguese East Africa have apparently the lowest tax per head, and Bechuanaland (*i.e.* the part annexed to the Cape Province) and

Southern Rhodesia the highest. In Southern Rhodesia the average is 10s. per head of the whole population.

"It is evident, therefore, that the demand on the natives made by the tax for administration is very considerably, in fact, probably much greater than his previous total earnings. He must therefore seek a sale for his produce and grow a larger quantity or market his labour. But the crop producers are often far from the market, and there may be little or no sale for the food on which they live. In Nyasaland and parts of Northern Rhodesia the native, although growing good crops, cannot sell anything to make up his hut-tax. As a result, large numbers of natives have to leave Nyasaland and Northern Rhodesia and go elsewhere to work to raise the hut-tax. Under the circumstances (says Mr Shantz) it would probably be better for the native to conscript his labour than to demand a tax where there is no available means of earning it. The rates of taxation compared with the natives' earning capacity are too high. The remedy is to secure a market for the produce the native grows or give him a crop for which there is a market. In his natural state the native here could be perfectly happy, but the tax forces on him the extra work, and he cannot secure direct or indirect employment without travelling far from his home. The effect of this condition on the whole social system is bad. If the market were available, the agricultural acreage would be increased and the surplus sold, and new money crops, such as cotton, coffee, or tea, would be grown. It seems to be primarily a question of cheaper transportation.

"Up to the present, native agricultural production has not been as greatly encouraged in Kenya as in other East African colonies. European agriculture is well developed here, and over a quarter of a million acres are now under cultivation and devoted largely to maize, cotton, sisal, and wheat."

The employment system of Kenya is buttressed by a Registration Law. All males (and, it is now proposed, all females, seeking employment in domestic

service or otherwise) have to be registered, to have their finger-prints taken by identification, and to carry their identification certificate with them wherever they go. It is only one step from this institution to the complete oppression of the native Pass Laws which obtain in Natal and the Northern Provinces of the Union of South Africa.

Probably many Kenya settlers, especially those who have gone there since the War, do not fully appreciate the philosophy of the established policy, though, if they will look back to the records of the arguments used in support of it, they will have little difficulty in discerning it. It is also, no doubt, the case that many, perhaps the majority, of the white settlers believe themselves to object, on principle, to compulsion of natives. If so, their feeling and influence do not yet transpire in the utterances of the men they allow to speak for them in public affairs. And in a white community dominant in such conditions as those of Kenya it is disastrous for native questions and the ventilation of native grievances to be made an election issue among the white electors. The presentation of a political case for the natives must necessarily thus be left principally to officials and missionaries.

The recent advocacy of East African Federation was, according to the account given by the Secretary of State,[1] pushed to the front by a movement representing the ideas and ambitions of the leaders of the European policy party in Kenya. The programme was quite frankly and simply stated. Kenya Europeans were to obtain an elected majority in the Kenya legislature, and thus control Kenya native policy. As there are more Europeans in Kenya than in any other East African territory, Kenya Europeans would claim to dominate the East African Federal Council. Kenya Settlers' Native policy would thus become the standard for native policy throughout East Africa. It has been one of the officially stated purposes of the idea of Federation that native policy throughout the territory should be uniform. This outspoken programme naturally created anxiety in Uganda and Tanganyika, which pursue a native policy not dominated as that of Kenya has hitherto been

[1] See White Paper [Cmd. 2904], July 1927.

by capitalist and Afrikander ideas. Further, Uganda and Tanganyika have been disquieted by the adoption in Northern Rhodesia of a Native Affairs Regulation Law having a suspicious family likeness to that recently passed in South Africa, and by the fact that the Secretary of State and the Governor of Kenya have recently been studying the methods of native administration in South Africa and Rhodesia and uttering compliments to their Governments upon their character. On the other hand, the stalwarts of Kenya settlers' policy would be equally alarmed by the prospect of Kenya being encircled in a Federation by States whose native policy might be so liberal as that of Uganda and Tanganyika.

It is of great importance to the future of the world and of Africa that it should be recognised what is at stake in these controversies. The Government of the South African Union, entangled in a past of injustice, has formulated a retrograde policy of repressive European supremacy, discrimination against natives, and increasing retrenchment and denial of equal rights. Native Africans, many thousands of whom are now fully educated and many far superior in natural intelligence to the average low-class South African white man, understand the position thoroughly. Their understanding and view of it will be shared by every educated African throughout all these territories, and their perception and judgment will pervade and colour the whole feeling of the uncivilised natives towards the white man, filling them with suspicion and latent hostility. The Government of Kenya, notwithstanding a petition signed within a fortnight by about 1500 white residents, recently passed an ordinance establishing a white Burgher Force to be recruited by conscription of Europeans. This is an institution derived directly from the idea of the Boer commandos for defence against and suppression of natives. It cannot fail to poison the interracial atmosphere. It encourages in the minds of the white community the quite fallacious idea that such a force is necessary to protect them against their native fellow subjects (if they treat them justly), and, more fatally, it establishes in the native mind the conviction that it is intended to dominate them in the interests of Europeans. (The ordinance, it is pleasing to

record, has so far proved unworkable, owing to the opposition of many settlers to conscription.)

From the time of the abolition of slavery, and during almost the whole of the nineteenth century, British Power was acquiring respect and confidence among Africans as the protector of human liberties. This reputation is now tottering. It is all but lost in the territories of the South African Union, and will be totally lost unless the intelligent and sane-minded minority of the community there can retrieve it: there are signs of its being in danger in Southern Rhodesia, though there we may still hope for wisdom. The Afrikander type of policy has been more outspokenly pursued until recently in Kenya than it has been in Southern Rhodesia, where, whatever the defects of the Chartered Company's rule, its native policy was more closely watched by the British Colonial Office. With an immense excess of natives over Europeans, and with increasing education, reacting indirectly on the feelings and judgments of the residual masses, the security of European supremacy and leadership in all South and East Africa is in danger of being undermined. Already Bechuanaland, Basutoland, and Swaziland are convinced that their only chance of maintaining their liberties is that the British Government, to whose protection they committed themselves, should refuse to hand them over to the South African Union. If that betrayal should be perpetrated, all Africans might well despair. Machine-guns and aeroplanes cannot in such a matter permanently avail. Grievous damage was done to the honour and credit of the white man in Kenya by unscrupulous repudiation of our solemn treaty with the Masai. The Kabaka of Uganda has issued an alarmed memorandum, from which it was evident that in the Federation movement he saw just such a threat to his kingdom as the Protectorates I have mentioned see to theirs in the prospect of incorporation in the South African Union.

CHAPTER XX

THE KENYA FORCED LABOUR CONTROVERSY

I THINK it useful to record in this book the facts of the controversy on the subject of labour policy in Kenya which gave rise to that White Paper of 1923 to which I have already referred. On the 23rd October 1919 the following circular was issued by the Chief Native Commissioner. The whole of its phrasing deserves careful attention:—

"EAST AFRICA PROTECTORATE[1]

"S. No. 17371. LABOUR CIRCULAR No. 1

"*Nairobi,*
"*23rd October* 1919

"*Native Labour required for non-Native Farms and other Private Undertakings*

"1. There appears to be still considerable shortage of labour in certain areas due to reluctance of the tribesmen to come out into the labour field; as it is the wish of Government that they should do so, His Excellency desires once again to bring the matter to the notice of Provincial and District Commissioners, and at the same time to state that he sincerely hopes that by an insistent advocacy of the Government's wishes in this connection an increasing supply of labour will result.

"2. His Excellency trusts that those officers who are in charge of what is (*sic*) termed labour-supplying districts are doing what they can to induce an augmentation of the supply of labour for the various farms

[1] See [Cmd. 873], August 1920.

and plantations in the Protectorate, and he feels assured that all officers will agree with him that the larger and more continuous the flow of labour is from the reserves the more satisfactory will be the relations as between the native people and the settlers and between the latter and the Government.

"3. The necessity for an increased supply of labour cannot be brought too frequently before the various native authorities, nor can they be too often reminded that it is in their own interests to see that their young men become wage-earners and do not remain idle for the greater part of the year. They should be informed that the Government is now taking steps to keep all native labourers while out of their reserves under supervision, and the conditions of camps, etc., regularly inspected.

"4. In continuation of previous communications on this very important subject, His Excellency desires to reiterate certain of his wishes and to add further instructions as follows:—

"(1) All Government officials in charge of native areas must exercise every possible lawful influence to induce able-bodied male natives to go into the labour field. Where farms are situated in the vicinity of a native area, women and children should be encouraged to go out for such labour as they can perform.

"(2) Native chiefs and elders must at all times render all possible lawful assistance on the foregoing lines. They should be repeatedly reminded that it is part of their duty to advise and encourage all unemployed young men in the areas under their jurisdiction to go out and work on plantations. They should be encouraged to visit plantations where their people are employed.

"(3) District Commissioners will keep a record of the names of those chiefs and headmen who are helpful and of those who are not helpful,

and will make reports to me from time to time for the information of His Excellency. The nature of these reports will be communicated to the chiefs. In cases where there is evidence that any Government headman is impervious to His Excellency's wishes the fact should be reported to me for His Excellency's information, together with any recommendations you may desire to make.

"(4) District Commissioners will, as often as occasion requires, hold public meetings at convenient centres to be attended by the native authorities. At these meetings labour requirements, places at which labour is offered, nature of work, and rates of pay must be explained. District Commissioners will invite employers or their agents to attend such meetings.

"(5) Employers or their agents requiring native labour will be invited and encouraged to enter freely any native reserve and there get in touch with the chiefs, headmen, and natives.

"(6) Requirements of native labour for Government departments should be met as far as possible from the more remote areas which do not at present supply an appreciable number of men for labour on plantations.

"5. His Excellency instructs me to state that constant endeavours will be made by this Government to obtain labour from the adjacent Conquered Territory in order that the supply of native labour in this country may be augmented. The native authorities might be informed of this and it be pointed out to them that, should any considerable number of natives be so introduced into this country, it will probably mean less money going into our native districts.

"6. It is hoped that the Resident Natives Ordinance, 1918, and the Natives Registration Ordinance, 1915,

will soon become operative. The provisions of these Ordinances should help to ameliorate the position.

"7. Should the labour difficulties continue it may be necessary to bring in other and special measures to meet the case; it is hoped, however, that insistence on the foregoing lines will have appreciable effect.

"JOHN AINSWORTH,
"*Chief Native Commissioner.*"

It will be noted that the Resident Natives Ordinance, establishing the obligation of forced labour for public purposes in the reserves, which I shall presently quote, and the Natives Registration Ordinance, which will also be more fully referred to, were expressedly at this time intended by the Government of Kenya to be auxiliary agencies for "ameliorating the position," not of the natives, but of the Europeans who experienced "labour difficulties" in the familiar capitalist sense of that term, and that, if these should prove insufficiently effectual, other and special measures were to be recognised as "necessary." There was no ambiguity as to the theory of development here implied, or any pandering to the fantasy that the interests of the natives were to be paramount or even to be first considered.

This circular was followed by two explanatory circulars, from which I need only quote the following extracts:—

"'Every possible lawful influence' means that officials, including chiefs and headmen, should at all times remind natives within their jurisdiction that it is in every way desirable for them to go out into the labour fields, and that unemployment in a reserve is highly undesirable. There is no intention that officers or chiefs and headmen should become recruiters of labour nor is it intended that men should be directed or ordered to proceed to particular employers, but there is the intention to induce the men by all lawful means to seek work. The elders should also be induced to adopt an attitude of refusing to allow their sons to remain idle. When unemployed young men are found in a reserve inquiries should be made as to what they

are doing and as to whether they have paid their poll-tax. Normally the tax due by the young men should be paid by them individually. No actual force can be employed to compel a man to go out to work; he can, however, be forced to pay his tax. It is quite understood that the majority of District Commissioners do follow out the foregoing procedure, and that in certain cases the result is for the moment deemed to be unsatisfactory, and that consequently officers despair of achieving success. It is felt, however, that insistence will gradually achieve ever-increasing results, hence this attempt at reiteration.

"The principle underlying the circular is contained in the third paragraph, viz. that it is in the interests of the natives themselves for the young men to become wage-earners and not to remain idle in their reserves for a large part of the year. The native authorities are therefore to exercise all lawful and proper influence to induce able-bodied male natives to go into the labour field, and it is their duty to advise and encourage all unemployed young men under jurisdiction to seek work on plantations."

The distinction appears to be somewhat finely drawn between an intention that officers should "become recruiters of labour," and that they should spy out unemployed young men, inquire what they are doing and whether they have paid their poll-tax, and, if they have not, take care that they are forced to pay it, or that they should exercise insistent advocacy to induce tribesmen to come out into the "labour field," and continue to do what they can to induce an augmentation of the supply of labour for the "farms and plantations" and exercise "every possible lawful influence" to induce able-bodied male natives and also women and children to go out for such labour. But I do not just here desire to emphasise the atmosphere of pressure conspicuous in these instructions. The importance of the circulars is that they quite unequivocally embody a statement of policy, namely, that it is the wish of the Government that natives should come out of their reserves and work on estates. The recipients of the circular are

not invited to judge whether a policy of promoting their employment within the reserves is practicable or might not be sounder. Indeed, so far was the Governor from conceiving the possibility of any such notion that he felt assured that all officers would agree with him that the larger and more continuous the flow of labour from the reserves, the better. He set no limit. Incidentally it would make the relations between the settlers and the Government much more agreeable. General Northey, no doubt, had in mind the oration of welcome addressed to him by Major Grogan, explaining to him his duties in this connection: that address which the late Lord Emmott described, speaking in Parliament, as "an insolent tirade." The question whether the relations between the Commissioners and Assistant Commissioners and their official protégés would be made agreeable and influential by their appearing among them in the character of Nosey Parkers to force them to pay taxes, in order that they might have, for their own interest, to work on estates, does not appear to have been considered.

The issue of these circulars evoked a memorandum signed by the Bishops of Mombasa and Uganda and by Mr J. W. Arthur of the Church of Scotland Mission, which in its turn gave rise to lively controversy in this country, the upshot of which was very important.

The "Bishops' Memorandum" opens with the following sentence:—

> "With the main purpose of the circulars, the prevention of idleness and the meeting of all legitimate means of the demand for necessary labour, we are in entire accord. Labour must be forthcoming if the country is to be developed as it should."

Here once more we encounter the "third period" axiom that the Imperial estate has to be "developed," without any indication of the character of development that is desirable, but an unquestioning presumption that the development is to be by means of "labour" to be forthcoming from among the natives to work on European estates. This postulate sufficiently indicates the Bishops' basic conception of such development, namely, that it is

to be approached from the starting-point of the European requirements and those of his industrial system, and not from those of the native and his agricultural and social economy.

The memorandum proceeds to make certain criticisms which I need not repeat on the character of the circulars, pointing out that they cannot but be interpreted as meaning that the Commissioners, as native authorities, are to put, either directly or through the chiefs, what would clearly amount to practical pressure on natives to do as the Governor desires. It points out, also, that the decision to encourage women and children to labour, bearing in mind the meaning that will inevitably be read into the word "encouraged," seems to the memorialists a dangerous policy.

After these admirable cautionary observations comes the following passage:—

> "With regard to the whole memorandum there are certain observations to be made.
>
> "*It introduces compulsory labour.* Whether this is a good thing or a bad thing we are not now concerned to say. We confine ourselves for the moment to the fact. Labour may be made compulsory in one of three ways: by force of circumstances, as in civilised countries; by law, as with ourselves during the War; or by official pressure, which stops short of actual command but aims at securing the identical results. Without the sanction of definite enactment no native chief, who is told that it is the wish of the Government that he should find labour—who has the matter insistently brought before him, who is reminded that this is part of his official duty, and who is periodically reported as one who is helpful or not helpful to the Government in this respect—can or will mistake the meaning of it all. He must and will, to the limit of his powers, compel his people to go out to work; technically, there is no compulsion; practically, compulsion could hardly take a stronger form."

The expression of the Bishops' opinion whether compulsory labour is a good thing or a bad thing is not long deferred: for two paragraphs later they boldly pronounce it:

"We do not disguise our anxiety, not as to the intention (which they have just explained to be the introduction of compulsory labour), but as to the practical effect of this memorandum. Yet when we have said this we recognise that much in this memorandum is good and indeed necessary. *Compulsory labour is not in itself an evil, and we would favour some form of compulsion*, at any rate for work of national importance, and provided that—

"(*a*) It is frankly recognised as compulsion and legalised as such, not veiled under such terms as advice, wishes, encouragement.

"(*b*) It is confined to able-bodied men, for in no case could it be tolerated that employers should indent for the labour of women and children.

"(*c*) The work be done under proper conditions, guaranteed by the Government.

"(*d*) The time of employment be limited and defined. A man who has done his full share of work in the plantations should be free from further pressure. We would suggest sixty days as a maximum period of compulsory service in each year.

"(*e*) Compulsion be exercised uniformly. Nothing short of complete lists, kept and checked by the District Commissioner in each district, recording the labour of each man, will prevent this.

"(*f*) The labourer be free to choose his sphere of service.

"(*g*) Reasonable exceptions be allowed.

"(*h*) As far as possible, compulsory labour be used for Government work.

"With these provisions we would favour compulsory labour as long as it is clearly a necessity. . . . We do not believe that there is the least intention, on either side" (*i.e.* presumably settlers or Government) "of exploiting natives for private ends. . . . Any form of compulsory service is certain to be intensely

unpopular with the natives. There is no more fruitful source of native discontent in any country than the Corvée. Some form, however, of compulsory service, we believe, in present conditions to be a necessity. . . . We believe that ideally all labour should be voluntary. We recognise that, at present, this is impossible, and that some form of pressure must be exerted if an adequate supply of labour necessary for the development of the country is to be secured.

"The missions welcome His Excellency's general policy, as expressed in his recent memorandum, and recognise, from his labour proposals, the earnest effort to meet, by all constitutional means, a great and pressing need. We believe, however, that it places far too great a power in the hands of native chiefs and headmen, and we therefore desire to see it modified on the lines above suggested."

The Government of Kenya promptly followed the lead of this kindly light from the Bishops and proceeded to introduce amendments into the relevant laws.

Section 7 of the Native Authority Ordinance, 1912, already enabled any headman to issue orders to be obeyed by the natives residing in his district requiring the able-bodied men to work in the making and maintaining of any watercourse or other work constructed or to be constructed or maintained for the benefit of the community to which such able-bodied men belonged, for not more than six days in any quarter. The Ordinance gave the headmen legal powers to make orders for sundry other purposes which need not here be rehearsed, including some which might invite criticism, such as the power to regulate the movement of natives from the jurisdiction of one headman to that of another; in fact, an embryo Pass Law. And it had a fine liberal omnibus clause enabling such orders to be issued "for any other purpose approved by the Governor in writing." But to embody the Bishops' suggestion an Ordinance was drafted to amend it by adding the power to order

"The provision for paid porters for Government's servants on tour and for the Government Transport

Department and for paid labour of work on the construction and maintenance of railways and roads wherever situate in the Protectorate and *for other work of a public nature whether of a like kind to the foregoing or not.*"

Assuredly the greatness of their purpose of development should not fail through craven fear of being great. They cast a wide net.

"Provided always that no person shall be required to work under the provisions of this clause

"(*a*) for a longer period than sixty days in one year" (in addition to the twenty-four days' Corvée provided for as quoted above);

"(*b*) if he be fully employed in any other occupation or has been so employed during the preceding twelve months for a period of three months."

The intention of the wording of this clause was, at the time, in Kenya, quite unequivocally understood and known to be that no native should be exempt from liability to sixty days' forced labour for the Government (in addition to his twenty-four days locally), unless he had been in the employment of a settler, or in other public employment, for a period of three months during the preceding twelve. Lord Milner, in his final dispatch on the subject, written in July 1920, apparently thought it discreet to overlook this interpretation. He said, "as regards compulsory labour for private employment, there could, of course, be no question of entertaining any proposals which involve this principle"; and though he said that the policy embodied in the circulars had been misinterpreted as implying that principle, he said nothing to that effect about the draft Ordinance, which succeeded those circulars and which, in fact, in consequence of the protests which were made in this country, was not allowed by Lord Milner's successor, Mr Winston Churchill, to become operative.

Obviously, in view of the distortion of the accounts habitually given of the habits of the natives in regard to their own industry, and of the characteristically inter-

mittent quality of the work they do, there would be very few natives indeed who, whatever work they had done in their own reserves, would be likely to be acknowledged as having been "fully employed in any other occupation for a period of three months," unless they had been serving under a contract for such continuous service with a European employer. That was what was intended to be understood. That was what the Bishops on whose suggestion the clause was founded said was intended, namely, that "*a man who has done his full share of work on the plantations* should be free from further pressure."

As apologists for the policy which was at this time being pursued in Kenya still occasionally rush into print to deny that the Government ever endeavoured to press by law labour upon plantations, I hope this plain record may set that question at rest in the minds of any such who read this book. Lord Milner's dispatch went a little beyond a discreet avoidance of comment in expressing a confidence that there had never been any intention on the part of the Governor either to suggest or to countenance any proposals involving the principle of compulsory labour for private employment. No one in touch with Kenya affairs at the time would have disputed that there was such an intention; or, except out of regard for British public opinion, would have thought it worth while to dissemble the fact. It was the openly advocated policy, if not officially of the Government at any rate of the settlers' leaders and spokesmen, as necessary for the Colony's interests, and, as we have seen from the above quotations, it was implied in the recommendations volunteered by the Bishops.

Those arrangements for the registration of natives, which the Bishops had equally frankly pointed out were necessary in order that everyone should be equally "pressed" to labour, and which the Chief Native Commissioner in his circular had expressed confidence, "would help to ameliorate the position," were duly enacted: and in due course produced among the natives manifestations of that intense unpopularity of such methods which the Bishops admitted was certain to be produced.

The circulars and the Bishops' memorandum aroused lively expressions of protest in this country, and Bishop

Frank Weston of Zanzibar came to England in 1920 to conduct a campaign against forced labour. Under his influence and that of the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Church of England Missionary Congress dissociated themselves from the views of the Bishops of Mombasa and Uganda. Bishop Weston had an interview with Lord Milner, of which his biographer says:

> "It was not a success. . . . Frank was the natural champion of Africans, but he sympathised with the new settlers and reserved his blame for the Colonial Authorities, who had plunged into a hasty scheme for opening up the country without considering the supply of labour. Lord Milner was irritated by Frank's vehemence, and Frank was irritated *by Lord Milner's insistence on the fact that the Bishops of Mombasa and Uganda were in favour of compulsion.* Next day, in writing to Arthur Cripps, he said: 'I saw Milner yesterday. It is no good. And how the Bishops of Mombasa and Uganda have played traitors! It is too horrible for words, and few people get red-hot against it. I am heart-sick with the Christian institutions—though you find Christ riding on such asses! My inner mind is to cut myself off from the British, and throw in my lot entirely with the Bantu—one can, at least, bear one's own witness to British and Bantu. But I do not see my way quite clearly yet. Of course, it would mean resigning my See. Hitherto I have thought it possible to help my flock, just because I had a See; but if one cannot save them from serfdom by one's position, one may as well suffer with them as an individual.'
>
> "There is more to the same effect, and a hope that the Labour Party might help.
>
> "The upshot of the efforts of Bishop Weston and others was that a representative Committee was formed and a new memorandum was drawn up for presentation to the Government, criticising what had been done, and asking for a Royal Commission to investigate the conditions and supply of labour in East Africa. The memorandum was signed by the

Archbishops of Canterbury, York, and Armagh, by the Primus of Scotland, by the Presbyterian Moderators in Scotland, and by the Chairmen or Presidents of the various Free Churches. Thirty-one missionary societies gave it an official approval. Nine peers of Cabinet rank signed it, including Lord Bryce, Lord Cave, and Lord Haldane. Eleven members of the House of Commons (five Conservatives, four Labour, and two Liberals) signed it, including Mr J. H. Thomas, E. F. L. Wood (Lord Irwin), and Mr Whitley, subsequently Speaker. Among other signatures were Sir Joseph Maclay, Mr W. L. Hichens, Sir George Parkin, secretary of the Rhodes Trust, and Dr Ernest Barker of the University of London.

"Frank had gone back to Africa before the Archbishop of Canterbury, on 14th December 1920, introduced the private deputation to Lord Milner, who was most sympathetic, so that it was hoped the Royal Commission would be appointed. However, he went out of office. Mr Winston Churchill was of another mind. He called home the Governors of Kenya and Uganda, and after consultation with them issued a new despatch on 5th September 1921. In it he decreed:

"1. Able-bodied men may be required to work in the making or maintaining of any water-course or other work constructed or to be constructed or maintained for the benefit of the community to which such able-bodied men belong, provided that no person shall be ordered or required to work in this way for more than six days in any quarter.

"2. Government officials will in future take no part in recruiting labour for private employment.

"3. The Native Authority Amendment Ordinance, 1920, is to remain on the Statute Book, but, except for paid porters for Government officials, it is not to be put into force without the sanction of the Secretary of State.

"4. Works of a public nature for which compulsion might be asked should be defined in an amending Ordinance.

"This dispatch was satisfactory. Frank was pleased, but he knew that difficulties with regard to labour were bound to recur, and that for many a long day those who cared for African welfare would have to exercise vigilance. It is not so much man's wickedness that we have to be afraid of, as man's unconsidered action. Again, it is so easy to persuade men that something is expedient and so hard to persuade them that something, which is not expedient, is just. When difficulties occur, compulsion is such a simple remedy, and so tempting; but experience teaches the unwisdom of doing evil that good may come."

It is difficult to write on these topics, when one has been accustomed to keep in view the actual record of the developing situations and the atmosphere of the local discussions in which they arise, without experiencing either a paralysing stupefaction at the beliefs which persons not embarrassed with such a positive habit of mind are able to persuade themselves that they entertain, or a tremor at the ingenuousness with which they expose themselves to the charge of hypocrisy in professing to be acting in the manner most beneficial to natives when they are obviously only concerned to do the best they can for themselves. The benevolent wisdom of Providence, Lord Milner believed, had, in fact, ordained such a happy conjunction. No intelligent man, certainly not the writer, contends that the presence of Europeans in African countries has not been and may not still be of advantage to native communities, as well as at the same time, as they intend it to be, in establishing themselves there, to themselves. It is however obvious, and is admitted as an evil which is calling for considered and far-reaching action towards abating it, that the effect of industrial employment on South African natives has been and is increasingly demoralising and disastrous for them. Its chief redeeming point may be that the evils with which it makes them acquainted are implanting in them an increasing determination to discover their own means for

amending them, if their rulers continue to shirk the task of doing so. It is obvious and admitted, by the most cogent South African witnesses before repeated public commissions, that the operation of white land-monopoly is creating an intolerable situation. It is admitted that the curtailment of the native production of food supply, due to this monopoly and to the increasing withdrawal of the labour of able-bodied natives from their own homes (which is both compelled by this increasing scarcity and itself reacts to increase it), are setting back native progress even in those parts of the Cape Colony where an intelligent native policy of agricultural settlement and development had been initiated. It is unquestionable, as I shall demonstrate in reviewing the history of the lesson in a future chapter,[1] that the effect of the prolonged application in the West Indies of the principles of the "European policy" for the development of white men's countries, on precisely the lines that have been so strenuously pressed in the new European possessions in Africa during the last forty years, was not to educate, civilise, and improve the negro, still less to make him industrious, but to render the inefficiency and unreliability of his labour so disastrous to European planting enterprise that the planters had to import Indian labour under criminally enforceable contracts in order to keep their estates going at all. Yet the methods of European capitalist development which in proportion to the extension of their application have increasingly produced these effects are still preached in the name of the Imperial duty of development; and presumably those who preach them imagine themselves to be preaching something that they believe to be, quite independently of the interest of the white man in making profits, of advantage to natives. Moreover, within the memory even of persons not more than middle-aged, we have witnessed the invention and propagation of the astonishing Gospel that human beings can be made industrious by being compelled to work: a proposition which every schoolboy knows to be fudge. It requires a peculiar kind of mentality to persuade oneself of such nonsense, and a mentality still more peculiar to have the face gravely to preach it as statesmanship. The late Lord

[1] Chapter XXVI.

Milner, who was a convinced and influential advocate of the doctrine, and who so triumphantly floored Bishop Weston with his own colleagues' memorandum in eulogy of compulsory labour, possessed that kind of mentality. He was able to persuade himself that it was right to entreat Mr Chamberlain not to temporise further with negotiations which might endanger the outbreak of the South African War, on the ground that in that event South Africa would be lost to the British Empire and the beneficent design of the Almighty be frustrated by the recreant weakness of politicians.

Such doctrines as that of the improvement of the native by "contact" and of the necessity for promoting contact by pressure upon him to work on estates or inducing him to become a labour-squatter—a system recognised as one of the pests of South Africa—commend themselves to such minds, and their formulation is influential and hypnotic. We have seen the form which the theory takes in the minds of the "practical men on the spot." The severe reverse which the policy of this method of compulsory improvement for Africans received as a result of the controversy that arose about it in this country under the circumstances above recorded is an illustration of some of the peculiarities of the working of our own public opinion.

The policy of capitalist development which was energetically let loose upon Kenya during the administration of Sir Charles Eliot and his successors attracted hardly any notice at home. Occasional flagrant scandals, such as our treatment of the Masai and certain profligate and preposterous land grants and deals, provoked an occasional ripple of questions in Parliament and articles in the Labour and Liberal Press: but for the most part those who interested themselves in the concerns of our new African territories were of the class of Imperial enthusiasts who had idolised Mr Rhodes and were satisfied that great and glorious Elizabethan adventures were being promoted by pioneer Britons in the uncivilised parts of the earth. Moreover, the vast majority of the public remained in that beatific state of belief with regard to the proceedings of Englishmen in relation to Africans which had been established during the two generations through which the second period

of Liberalism and Humanitarianism in Colonial policy had persisted. Consequently they took little notice. The unscrupulous proceedings in Rhodesia and Upper East Africa permitted by the Colonial Office and encouraged by the Foreign Office did not catch their attention. It required the incident of the Bishops' Memorandum to queer the Elysian pitch on which our new Imperial pioneers enjoyed so long an innings. That memorandum touched our non-political public in a non-political spot of their sensibilities. "There is," sang the late Mr W. S. Gilbert—"there is a length to which, you know, Colonial Bishops cannot go," and the solemn paradoxes of the memorandum, drafted no doubt by the Bishops under the hypnotic influence of the great gospel of Development or some other form of African lethargy, produced, first in the Church of England Missionary Congress and in a contemporary meeting in Queen's Hall, at which parts of the memorandum and the Kenya circulars were read, and later, in wider circles, the same sort of arrest of attention that Mr Gilbert's Bishop protested would be aroused in his congregation

> "If they saw their Bishop land
> His leg supported in his hand,
> . . . . . .
> 'Twould pain them very much!"

It did. No normal man or woman could fail to notice there was something out of joint in the posture of their Bishops of East African Rumtifoo.

The material outcome of the discussions aroused by this arresting phenomenon was the Duke of Devonshire's revolutionary White Paper of 1923, to which I have referred more than once, in which His Majesty's Government recorded "their considered opinion that the interests of the African natives must be paramount, and that, if and when those interests and those of the immigrant races should conflict, the former should prevail."

Unfortunately, in connection with such pronouncements as this there is ground for apprehension lest British statesmanship should manifest itself as apparently hypocritical. The topic of trusteeship and its implications and

the question whether it is honest to say that the interests of African natives are even now regarded as paramount in Africa, which it would have been merely ridiculous to say that they had been up to the date of that memorandum, will demand a fresh chapter.

The controversy aroused by the Bishops' Memorandum brought into public attention the whole question of forced or compulsory labour. To many in this country it was a new and startling discovery that forced labour, including unpaid forced labour, was an institution prevalent in the British Empire. The notion was quite incompatible with the principles established in the second period of colonial policy and traditionally supposed to be still observed. The prodigious growth of the institution of compulsory labour is indeed a phenomenon of the third period, that of capitalist imperialism, and that development has been defended on grounds which is not too much to say are essentially fraudulent. The root of the notion that it is not oppressive for European Governments to impose compulsory labour on Africans for the purpose of developing European Imperial estates (so far as justification, other than the right and will of the stronger is offered), is to be found in the very convenient and sensible custom prevalent in primitive village communities of arranging that necessary local common services requiring simple labour shall be provided for by equal contributions of personal labour on the part of all the able-bodied men of the village community. This customary obligation in its primitive form among our own forefathers involved the duty of bearing arms and fighting, the duty of making and cleaning roads, building and repairing bridges, repairing flood or storm damage, and such other elementary operations necessary for the business and health of the local group as might from time to time be required. It is the foundation of our system of local rating for highway and sanitary purposes. It came into England and prevailed widely in all European communities in the forms of the Wehr-bote, Burh-bote, Brig-bote, and similar obligations familiar to historians. In the development of feudalism certain of these obligations to the community were transformed into obligations to the manorial lord, and became known as the Corvée. They are to be found in their

elementary form in primitive communities all over the world to-day. In such communities, such of them as survive owing to current public necessities are executed under the directions of the village headman or chief. They are a perfectly reasonable and healthy expedient for getting local services done. Where every adult man is able and accustomed to perform the sort of labour required it is much simpler to get it done in that way than to set up a money-rating system, to levy and collect taxes and pay them out by employing labour at wages. Nevertheless, as communities develop, the capacity of the citizens for such tasks becomes differentiated, and the system of compounding for the obligations and finding substitutes generally in some measure grows up.

Now, when European Governments began to invade Africa, and needed porters for transport, they found that it was in the power of the chiefs to requisition tribesmen for any work that was needed for tribal purposes. They abused and caused the chiefs to abuse this custom by requiring the chiefs under threat of penalties or inducing them by payments which they received on behalf of the tribe or village to exercise this power of requisition. The power was in some territories oppressively and grossly abused, and many thousands of porters thus requisitioned succumbed to their hardships. The system was extensively used in British territories, especially during the period of pacification; but in West Africa the Colonial Office continued, in the earlier years at any rate of the third period, to keep it as far as possible within bounds, and to maintain the requirement that the labour should always be paid for, which was by no means the case in the territories of other participants in the division of Africa.

With the extension of the idea of the duty of Development and of the paramount authority of that duty the theory of the purposes for which the application of this institution might properly be resorted to was enlarged. Labour was requisitioned through the chiefs for any manner of purpose which the European authority chose to consider to be in the public interest of the State, not only for the transport of public officers and for the building of railways or any other public works, but for the development of the property

through the operations of European planters and miners, to whom requisitioned labour was directly assigned and who directly obtained the profits, the public advantage (in addition to fees and taxes) being the development of the colony. To review the gross abuses of these proceedings, which were very much worse in the territories of some European Powers than of others, would occupy far too much space: the excesses of German government in this line were made one of the pretexts for taking away from Germany Tanganyika and her other African colonies. In other territories the procedure has, no doubt, to a great extent been frankly arbitrary; but in British territories and in others it has constantly been defended and sought to be justified both in Parliament and to the natives on the analogy of the latter's own tribal customs. The argument is plainly dishonest: the tribal Corvée is established by common consent as an obviously useful and convenient institution: the Government Corvée is imposed in the interests of the European immigrant, and in many cases the pretext that it was of any benefit, direct or indirect, to the natives was palpably impudent nonsense.

Nevertheless, in so far as the development of the territories might be admitted as being a benefit to the natives, it was arguable, and it is still argued, that compulsory labour is a justifiable form of taxation. This was one of the arguments of the Bishops' Memorandum which I have quoted. It is still acted on in all these European African territories, but the evils and injustices of the system are now so far generally recognised that the International Labour Office is maturing arrangements for a conference and convention to deal with the whole question of compulsory labour, to lay down limiting principles for its exaction, if it is deemed right to maintain it at all, and to prescribe the essential conditions to be observed for the protection of natives.

If compulsory labour may be imposed as a form of taxation in the interests of development it is essential to put some restriction upon the degree and pace of development. The undeveloped resources of mineral and vegetable wealth which could be turned to the profit of Europeans, if labour could be found to exploit them, are far in excess of any

possible labour supply that can be drawn from the Continent's peoples. Even if the extent of compulsion were very moderate, the effective demand of capital for labour which it could afford to offer attractive wages is greater than can be met by the populations available without the destruction of native society. Natives in Central African mining enterprises are well paid and well looked after: they are doubtless fairly well paid and are well looked after in some planting enterprises, though the conditions in these are far less attractive, and the wages, as a rule, not more than sixpence a day. The more well-paying enterprises are developed the greater, as an antecedent necessity, is the demand for railways and roads and other public works to serve them. The tendency, therefore, to demand too great a draft on the labour supply is unlimited, and constantly tends to increase. The Belgian Government of the Congo is so far the only European Government which is seriously and carefully taking in hand a question of restricting the demand which may be made for any purpose whatever and for all purposes taken together on the native labour supply for European enterprises of development. Railway development in Kenya and elsewhere has been feverishly pushed on because Europeans had grown crops which were ready for transport, and to complete these works the Government has deemed it a public necessity compulsorily to requisition labour at the expense and to the detriment of the natives. This has been done even since the Duke of Devonshire had pronounced that the interests of the natives were to be paramount. Unless and until the programme of development, whether public or by private planting and enterprise, is considered and regulated from the point of view of the direct interests of the natives and not from the point of view of developing the European Imperial estate, with merely the excuse of the pretext that indirectly and in the long run the native will benefit, the whole claim of European powers to be acting as trustees for natives and the claim of our own Colonial Office to be administering in the interests of natives is conspicuously hypocritical.

With regard to forced labour, the case which I have argued with some wearisome repetition in this and preceding chapters is so summarily and succinctly put by Bishop

Weston in his pamphlet, *The Serfs of Britain*, that I think I cannot do better than close this chapter by substantial quotations from that manifesto.

THE SERFS OF GREAT BRITAIN

(*Extracts*)

"Africans were promised protection and freedom by the allies. Like all the weaker peoples, they were to share the glories of the new world. They were to feel the effect of the consecration to God of our Imperial life, a consecration solemnly proclaimed by the Prime Ministers of the Empire in a public manifesto.

"In August last, Lord Milner, in the name of the Empire, announced to East Africa the joyful fate allotted to it. That fate is Forced Labour. Africans are to labour under compulsion for the Government; they are to work under official encouragement or pressure for the white members of the Empire.

"I appeal directly to Great Britain and her Dominions to save the Africans from this new form of slavery.

"This I do for three reasons: First, because it is political madness, at this time of day, to try and subject a weaker people to serfdom or to slavery. It cannot be done. To attempt it is to lay up for ourselves trouble of the worst kind. Africans are too wide-awake, and have too many friends in America, to allow anyone to re-enslave them.

"Secondly, it is moral madness. The Europeans who use these serfs will pay for it in moral deterioration. And the nation that connives at it will not be far behind them.

"Thirdly, it is so definitely an anti-Christian policy that no one who adopts it can any longer justify the Gospel of Christ to the African peoples. 'Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these My brethren, ye have done it unto Me.'

"Will Christian men dare to say that, were the Christ in our midst, we should be morally right in

compelling, or in pressing Him against His will, to do our work for us?

"I venture, therefore, to appeal to all British men and women to compel our Government to withdraw these labour laws. They are immoral: they constitute a breach of faith: they are dangerous to the Empire's peace: they are a betrayal of weaker peoples whose guardians we claim to be: and they are an offence against the Lord Christ.

"The facts of the case are beyond dispute. They are contained in two decrees of the Zanzibar Government, and in Lord Milner's 'Despatch to the Governor of the East Africa Protectorate relating to Native Labour,' dated August 1920.

"My account of them follows in the form of a memorandum drawn up for the Committee of the Universities' Mission to Central Africa.

"It remains to say that I have a twenty-two years' experience of Africans whom this new policy must affect; and that the Government was pleased to use my experience when it wanted to persuade the world that the Germans must be deprived of their colony in East Africa. This said, let us face the facts.

"I. Zanzibar

"(*a*) In Decree 25 of 1917 it is ordered that any native under fifty, in good health and not in regular employment, who is registered under the Adult Male Persons Registration Order, must do any work within the Protectorate the Labour Board may order.

"The Labour Board consists of not less than five persons, two of whom are not members of Government.

"The Board has power to fix work, the place where the work is to be done (*e.g.* in Zanzibar or Pemba), and the rate of wages.

"(*b*) In Decree 15 of 1919 the Board is ordered only to use the natives for work of a public nature for the general good of the community. Also, it is required to exempt from forced labour natives who have done sixty days' work for Government *or a private person*

within the year (beginning 1st January) in which he is called up.

"(*Note.*—(1) If a man is called up before 1st March he cannot have done sixty days. So that any man not in regular work, who does not take a job daily from 1st January until 1st March, is liable to forced labour on 2nd March.

"(2) What is work of a public nature for the general good of the community?

"In practice, unless things have altered recently, it includes the picking of cloves for private employers, since cloves pay 25 per cent. duty to the Government.

"It also, quite definitely, means compulsory labour on Government plantations, for the Government sells cloves in Zanzibar and Pemba.

"(3) Thus in Zanzibar the ordinary able-bodied native is at the mercy of the Government. There seems to be no decreed limit to his days of labour, probably because no one can say off-hand how long the clove harvest will last.)

"II. British East Africa

"(a) *Compulsory Labour*

"Any work the Governor decrees to be 'of a public nature,' in addition to Government transport, railways, roads, etc., may be done by forced labourers, working sixty days a year each.

"A native is liable to this who is not in regular work, or who has not done three months' work for an employer, public or private, within the previous year.

"No allowance is made for going to and from the area of work; the sixty days may reach seventy or more.

"In addition he is liable to twenty-four days' local compulsory labour every year. This makes eighty-four days at least.

"(b) *Encouraged Labour*

"(1) District officials and native headmen are ordered to 'encourage' men to work for European

planters. Failure on the part of headmen to do this successfully is to be reported to the Governor, the headman involved being informed of the report and its character.

"The meaning of 'encouragement' is revealed to us in an order that headmen must not attempt to bring 'pressure' to bear upon men whose labour is needed for the cultivation of their own lands in the reserve. So that in all other cases 'encouragement' spells 'pressure.'

"(2) Women and children are to be 'encouraged' to work on plantations near their own villages.

"III. The Evils Involved in this Scheme.

"(i) *Forced Labour is Immoral*

"(*a*) Ethically, forced labour except in war-time is indefensible.

"A community may rightly be expected to preserve its local roads, etc., and to supply its officials with carriers for local journeys. In all other respects hunger is the only natural taskmaster. The call of service to the human race is always valid; but it does not summon a man to work for the enrichment of a small band of commercial foreigners.

"(*b*) Again, the doctrine that Europeans are justified on commercial grounds in making serfs of the Africans is immoral.

"(*c*) Even were it true that Africans are idle, the remedy must not be one that is in itself immoral.

"In fact the African is not idle. Some tribes use women for work far more than men, especially warlike tribes. But in many tribes the men work with the women. And the average African has a hard task to get food for himself and his family.

"(ii) *It Results in Social Ills*

"(*a*) Africans who are removed from their villages for long periods of time, and acquire the habit of absence from home, rarely keep their households together.

"The wives must be left at home to look after the fields, and are often unfaithful. The men are responsible for concubinage and prostitution wherever they are made to reside for long periods, with the result that homes are broken, venereal diseases are spread broadcast, the birth-rate is lowered, and a new type of African man is created.

"(*b*) There can be nothing worse for a country than the multiplication of cases of natives who have cast off all natural ties and live vicious lives in commercial centres or on European farms. Such men become a source of danger to the community. The separation of Africans from their village life is fraught with the gravest danger to themselves and to the race. And young men who know they must go away to work every year will give up marriage.

"(*c*) The supply of labour will be largely decreased, through the fall in the birth-rate. This is not a matter of speculation; it is a fact of experience.

"In East Africa a wise Government would conserve the already very small number of potential labourers. It would not sacrifice the future to the present.

"(iii) *It Involves Cruelty*

"(*a*) The pressing of the men always involves cruelty.

"(*b*) The herding of the men together, their medical inspection, their feeding, etc., etc., are very rarely carried out in a way that is justifiable. The Government has not a staff adequate to the task; few Europeans really care for the natives; and the overseers are almost always callous and selfish. And always the lash is used freely in such circumstances.

"(*c*) Medical officers are too few to carry out the vague promises made in Lord Milner's despatch.

"(*d*) In the War, when we had a large staff and unlimited funds, the treatment of the Government porters was scandalous. How can we trust the Government now, when officials are few and funds cut down to the lowest possible sum?

"Personally, speaking from practical experience, I maintain that the Government cannot carry out these proposals without cruelty to the individuals. The number of subordinate officials who will take proper care of Africans, knowing their language and sympathising with their needs, is far too few.

"(iv) *It Depends upon Headmen*

"(*a*) Headmen, seeking to stand well with the Governor, will certainly exercise 'pressure.'

"Even the Bishops who support the Government say of this: 'He must and will, to the limits of his power, compel his people to go out to work; technically, there is no compulsion; practically, compulsion could hardly take a stronger form.'

"(*b*) An African does not distinguish between the 'desire' and the 'order' of the Government. If he does not want to go he will try to hide himself, and be taken by force in order to listen to the headman's 'encouragement.'

"(*c*) Bribes by Europeans will be frequent, in spite of the very mild penalty enacted in the case of anyone who, by some miracle, shall be convicted of giving presents to a headman.

"IV. A New Policy

"This set of proposals marks a new policy. Great Britain is doing with its Africans what Lenin and Trotsky are said to do with Russians. It is ordering a conscription of citizens for labour. Also, it is placing the resources of the Government at the service of a small band of European settlers. The reservations made by Lord Milner in this respect are mere empty phrases, as we who live in Africa well know.

"V. Overcrowded Colonies

"The fact is that labour was short in British East Africa before the Government decided, under pressure

from local business men, to 'develop' the country. Many new plantations have been granted to ex-officers and to rich English people. Now the natives must pay the penalty of their rulers' bad policy.

"VI. The Conclusion of the Whole Matter

"It is evident that the Africans are not safe from forced labour or from 'official encouragement' to do what they do not want to do, as long as the Government of Great Britain regards East Africa as a commercial asset, to be developed in the interests of a small number of settlers, and exploited for the relief of the British taxpayer.

"When I wrote my Open Letter to General Smuts I called it 'Great Britain's Scrap of Paper: Will she honour it?' I was alluding to her promise of justice to the weaker peoples. The Imperial Government took my letter, cut out some inconvenient passages, and published it under the title, 'The Black Slaves of Prussia.' I suggest that East Africans have now become 'The Black Serfs of Great Britain.'

"VII. The New Slavery

"An African will now be liable to do at least 84 days forced labour every year. As a slave, in the days when I first knew Africa, and even in recent times under the German flag, a man gave 2 days a week, or 104 in the year, to his master.

"The free British subject has, therefore, only 20 days less forced work than the slave. On the other hand, the slave was at home, with his wife and family. Under this new system the Africans will be separated from their homes, and their households will be in danger of disruption, for the man will not submit his wife to the dangers of camp life, nor can they both leave their fields, unless they and their children are to starve.

"I ask, is this England's notion of 'protecting the weaker races'?"

The International Missionary Council, held at Jerusalem in April 1928, passed the following resolution:—

> "It is essential that Governments concerned with undeveloped areas should apply to them the knowledge gained by a century of experience of the measures needed to prevent economic and social injustice, and in particular that they should (*a*) stop at once the practice of employing forced labour by companies or private individuals, and also, except in cases of immediate and unforeseen national emergency, by public authorities."

CHAPTER XXI

DEVELOPMENT AND CIVILISATION

THE assertion is frequent and nowhere more dogmatic than (as Mrs Buxton mentions) in Kenya, that what is spoken of as the "West African" policy, meaning that of encouraging and assisting Africans to develop their own country, leaving the proprietary rights in their hand and its resources in their ownership, and furnishing them through Government agency with roads and transport facilities and education, is unsuitable for what are called "white men's countries" in Africa. If one examines the reason for this opinion it is found to arise out of the theory that it is necessary to effect what is described as the "development" of these countries and to effect it as quickly as possible. This doctrine has so far attained the prerogative of an axiom of political duty that its cogency seems to be taken for granted and indeed as self-evident.

I have quoted Mrs Buxton's apparent adoption of this postulate: it is constant throughout the apologetics and propaganda of commercial Imperialism. Out of innumerable similar utterances from this pulpit I may quote as typical the following passage from the Report of the proceedings of the Conference of East African Governors held at Tukuyu in Tanganyika in 1926:—

> "The dual policy" (that is to say, the official Government policy then recently proclaimed in Kenya, of doing something for natives as well as for European immigrants) "raises considerable problems of its own. On the one hand there is the obligation which rests on every civilised Government of raising the capacities of its human subjects to their fullest expression; on the other there is *the equally imperative duty* of developing to the utmost the productive powers of its

possessions. This latter duty cannot be performed under any system which sacrifices the native human being to foreign exploitation of the soil. It is not possible to allocate to each area the quota of human labour required for complete commercial success. The whole problem is to arrive at a just and far-seeing method of harmonising the best progress and welfare of the native inhabitants with the maximum of production."

This passage, it must be admitted, is exceedingly general in its terms. It appears to me to be deficient in precise indication of what it is intended to mean. Some of the propositions which it seems to assert are questionable, or at least demand some careful explanation of their application.

It posits dogmatically the commercial Imperialist axiom that it is the "imperative duty" of every civilised Government to "develop" to the utmost the productive powers of its "possessions." What, precisely, is this sentence intended to mean? It appears to be an equivalent paraphrase of that classical theorem that it is the duty of an Imperial power to "develop" its undeveloped estates which has dominated Imperialist policy during its third period, and against which the League of Nations doctrine of Trusteeship for natives was formulated as a corrective. Its interpretation in this sense is corroborated by the evident conception of this process on the part of whoever drafted this memorandum as one which demands, but can only incompletely effect, the allocation of quotas of human labour to employers engaged in the process of commercial exploitation. This cannot be done to the extent required for "complete" commercial success—whatever may be the standard of such completeness. But the sentence implies the view that it is part of the duty of a Government engaged in "developing" to allocate such human labour as satisfactorily as it can. This is the view that Portuguese Governments have taken in their African possessions, and I have shown how they apply it.[1] It has been followed in the French and Belgian Congo, to a degree which is already recognised by the French and Belgian Governments as

[1] See Chapter XV.

excessive and mischievous—so much so that the Belgian Government has now gone so far as to order a census of the available native labour, and to prescribe the maximum which may be taken from any particular area, with a view to regulating this drain on native communities in the interests of the natives, considered from their point of view and not from that of "development." No British Government in Africa has gone so far as have other European Governments in the direction of the "allocation" of labour, but the Belgian Government is now setting a better example than the British Government in approaching the question of allocation from the side of the natives and not from that of European Imperialism.[1]

I wish to examine the implications of this dogma of "the imperative duty of development." I invite every one of my readers carefully to consider what it is that it means. As I understand it, it means that in certain countries there are natural resources available for the production of human wealth which are not as yet being fully exploited. There are minerals, of which European science and industry can enable human use to be made: the soil by European methods of culture can be made to produce raw materials for European manufacture and food for European consumption. The minerals are gold, platinum, tin, copper, lead, iron, coal, and, of course, diamonds—and others of minor importance. The most important of the cultural staples are oils and fibres, corn, wheat, rice, and other starch-producing vegetables, as well as more expensive articles of consumption, rather of the nature of luxuries, such as tobacco, coffee, cocoa, and tea. The sustenance of the human race, which is the primary concern of its industry, can beyond all question be greatly added to by the application of some of the methods of exploitation evolved in European societies. The realisation of these undeveloped fecundities requires first of all the construction of railways and roads, the use of rivers and lakes for transport by steam and motor vessels, and the establishment of centres of commerce for the purchase and sale of produce. Concurrently, one of the most important possibilities is the improvement of conditions of health, both in order to make the activities of

[1] See *Le Problème de la Main-d'œuvre au Congo Belge.*

Europeans possible in these countries and to diminish the wastage of native life which now takes place. The European, in projecting the "development" of these countries, quite legitimately enters upon the enterprise primarily for his own purposes—that is to say, for the enrichment or with a view to the better nutrition and conveniences of himself and his fellow-countrymen. He has done the same on the North American Continent, in the United States and Canada, in Australia and New Zealand. In all those countries the situation has been straightforward. He has generally gone out as a pioneer, prepared to do his own work, and has gradually built up his organisation of industry and production after his own European model. Organised capital has co-ordinated his operations, and investments have been made from his own countries to finance the employment of his labour.

But in the modern African territories the case has been different. There have been added to the direct self-contained activities of the Europeans the aims of developing not only by their own labour and ingenuity the sub-human resources of the country, but also the productive potentialities of the labour force of the natives. And here again the European, in so far as he takes any actual practical part in the business, aims at developing this element in the local resources, namely, the ability of the native to labour, primarily for his, the European's, own purposes, and for the purposes of his own Imperial community. Nevertheless, though this purpose is the primary and most effectually active incentive to imperial "estate development," it would not be fair to regard it as the sole and exclusive purpose of all those who as statesmen and administrators promote it. With the idea of developing our African "estates" for the Empire there is, though in remoter forms, associated the idea that the powers of the native may, under European guidance, be improved and exercised to his own economic and social advantage. They may, it is urged, be more efficiently used on precisely the same lines as those of the primary purpose of the white man, namely, that he may produce more wealth for his own consumption and maintenance. This he may do, possibly, by working more effectually for himself; but the mode in which the native is to

be benefited is more generally conceived to be that he can be employed by the European so productively under the latter's organised methods that the European will be able to pay him wages which will give him also a greater command of commodities, especially European imports, than he can obtain by his own primitive methods of work. The improvement of transport facilities and of health conditions, which is necessary to enable the European to pursue his own economic business, is also necessarily, it is conceived, of advantage to the native.

Here we begin to enter on controversial ground. It is debatable, although most Europeans are naturally prone to start off without any doubt of it, whether the establishment of Europeans in uncivilised African countries, not as producers for themselves, administrators, or educators, but as employers of wage-paid Africans, is really of economic advantage to the latter. It certainly is not unmixedly so. That is admitted by everyone. But economic advantage is not the only form in which it is held that the development, and the rapid development, of African countries by European enterprise is for the good of the natives. It is conceived desirable that the natives should become "civilised," in the European sense of the word. And yet, simultaneously, we see the curious paradox that while in some mixed communities what our journalists call a "slogan" is now being made of the phrase "European civilisation," it is outspokenly claimed to be more important to "safeguard European civilisation" among the whites by suppressing and even [1] exterminating the natives than to reinforce it by bringing them into it. This, however, is an attitude which is chiefly conspicuous in South Africa, or in those other parts which Africander ideas have permeated. Generally speaking, the disinterested European world still has confidence that European civilisation, and contact with those who claim to represent it, are good things in themselves for the African. It sees reason for confidence in the results of such contact for Africans, whether as transplanted, in the New World and the West Indies, or in our own West African Colonies.

These debatable questions arise, of course, in the

[1] See Mr Elliott's evidence, pp. 160, 161.

fields of moral and sociological controversy, distinguishable from that of economic progress referred to just previously: and in those fields we have to do with that other class of men who find their work in African countries, the administrators and the missionaries, as distinct from the working settlers, those who go to do work primarily from a spiritual and not from a secular impulse. And they necessarily have important contributions to make, when we say we aim at civilising the natives, to the question of what we mean by civilisation and what are its essentials.

If we were all of us complacent adherents of the critique of Karl Marx, accepting what is called the materialistic theory of civilisation, we should find the question quite simple. Modern Western civilisation, we should say, is the idealisation of the Western industrial form: it rests upon the exploitation of labour by a capitalist employing class: as does the Imperialist development policy in Africa, where white men do not go to do their own work, but with the intention of getting black men to do it for them. Western civilisation will therefore operate there in its most characteristic form, unmitigated by any of the traditions and palliatives which affect it in Old-world communities. Western civilisation will therefore unquestionably, the Marxist would say, be disastrous to native African communities, and he would have plenty of examples of its working to point to in support of this judgment.

The writer does not accept the Marxist account of civilisation, and feels himself entitled to mention that fact with some complacency and assurance as having been one of those Socialists who, forty and more years ago, were contributory to exposing for the early Socialist movement in this country the fallacies and limitations of the Marxian gospel; which circumstance is historically one of the reasons why the English Socialist and Labour movement has developed on lines which have made the British Labour Party the strongest and most progressive political force in this or any other country. In considering the question what we mean by civilisation, and especially by the term Western civilisation, we have, in my opinion, to go a great deal deeper than the terrain of material interests.

Whilst, therefore, I do not consider it fatally necessary

that the introduction of European methods of industry into Africa must be disastrous for the natives, I think it is unquestionable, and indeed would be admitted by observers of all schools of opinion, that there is in them much that does act disastrously, and I am quite satisfied that there is no ground at all for presumption that the capitalist producing system is bound to be advantageous for them. If European civilisation, which is presumed now so largely (but in my understanding of it, fallaciously) to rest upon that system is truly a good thing, desirable to be shared in by Africans, we shall do well to examine why that is so.

Many people are prone to assume that every Englishman who goes out to an African country to make his living there is in himself by his own character a missionary of civilisation. But that is disputable, not because it is disputable whether all such colonists are themselves good representatives of European civilisation, but because the purpose for which they go and the relations in which primarily they come into contact with Africans are precisely not those of what the educated European regards as civilisation in its liberal sense, but are precisely those with which the Marxist identifies it, namely, the economic relation of capitalist employer with proletarian wage-worker. Moreover, we are incessantly reminded by the apostles of Commercial Imperialism, from Governors downwards, that the secret of promoting civilisation among the natives is to create in them "new wants," so that they may buy the commodities European civilisation makes use of, and thus become more like Europeans, and, reciprocally, be impelled to seek money wherewith to buy them by working on the European's estates and in his mines. They are to be appealed to by material incentives. This economic philosophy of Capitalist Imperialism, the belief that African natives will be civilised by buying cheap European goods and by being drawn into the capitalist system of wage employment, is essentially itself Marxist materialism. The Marxian Communists of the League against Imperialism joyfully recognise and point this out. But the Missionary Churches as a whole, and the British Socialist movement, have always denied the theory. Civilisation is not economic opulence. It is not the capacity to produce wealth abundantly, or to satisfy

material needs with little labour: it is the use which is made of these means and abilities by human beings in their social relations, and the human spirit, temper, and estimation one towards another entertained by the members of a society whose material needs are served. Civilisation is not an affair of industry, or of disposition to industry: it is an affair of morals and of the arts, and for its highest manifestations requires little more material basis than an adequate nutritive economy. Africa will not be civilised by demanding that her people shall nourish Europe. She can nourish herself quite well enough for progressive civilisation. Capitalism in Europe, and still more so in mixed racial communities, is manifestly antagonistic to and destructive of a civilisation of art and morals. That is the Socialists' most fundamental ground for attacking it. The civilisation of Europe is a very ancient and profoundly-rooted florescence. The spiritual formulas and habits which constitute it are older than the modern Capitalist Industrial system, older than the Elizabethan Company system, resurrected with such Imperialist trumpetings, older than the system of private landlordism, older even than the industrial system of slavery. Much of them is common to European and Asiatic civilisations: their fundamentals are common to all humanity. So far as Northern Europe is concerned they were imposed upon its societies by the Catholic Church, working upon the foundations of Roman law and Roman organisation, themselves civilised by Asiatic Etruria and the efflorescence of Mediterranean genius diffused through the Ionian Empire under the stimulus of Egypt, Arabia, Persia, and India. All such recognised human civilisation accounts for itself by a theory of human progress, differently formulated in different religions, and by different critiques of art and psychology, but identical in its essential idea with what is expressed in the Collect of the Catholic Church, that it arises from God putting into men's hearts "good desires," of quite a different character from the "new wants" inspired by the advertisement of European commodities. And that these "desires" are diffused and stimulated by what is broadly called education, or culture, which is traditional, and not by the mechanical creation and satis-

faction of economic appetites. This, no doubt, is what is in the minds of the more intelligent believers in civilisation by "contact." The idea that a community of immigrant farmers, mine-foremen, and other industrial employers of underpaid wage-labourers, is the kind of community that best implants or maintains the essentials of human civilisation, is, to put it mildly, quite unhistorical. Realistically considered it is preposterous and grotesque.

It may, indeed, be assumed that the European statesmen who direct African policy are inheritors of our civilisation, although the principles on which they sanction dealings with African natives might sometimes appear to suggest a doubt of the fact, and it might be less confidently assumed that many European colonists are worthy inheritors of that civilisation. But in dealing with the question what are the essentials of European civilisation whereby Europeans can benefit African natives by contact, by employment, and by rendering them more efficient producers of wealth, it is necessary to recognise that the class who have the greatest right to speak about the essentials of Western civilisation are the class of religious and intellectual workers represented rather by the missionary and the schoolmaster than by the city financier of African enterprise (who does not nowadays belong to the Clapham Sect), or the pioneer farming settler. And it is a remarkable and noteworthy fact that it is the religious and educated bodies in these communities that have always seen most to find fault with both in the social morality and in the conceptions of what is good for the natives of the so-called practical men who are constantly glorified in this country as the pioneer agents of civilisation whose opinion ought primarily to be followed by statesmen at home as those of "the men on the spot," more accurately describable, perhaps, as the men "on the job": being engaged in materialist purposes (legitimate and, we may even presume, advantageous), but not, except in the sense of the Marxist philosophy, in the purposes of civilisation.

CHAPTER XXII

PASS LAWS AND REGISTRATION

No institution of government in South and East Africa is more detested by the natives, presses more arbitrarily upon them, is more liable to abuse and more provocative, among the sophisticated industrialised natives, of dishonesty, evasion, and trickery, than the so-called "Pass" Laws. These laws have an old and consistent history. I quote their origin from Professor W. M. Macmillan's *History of the Cape Colour Question.*[1]

> "The Hottentot question of the eighteen-twenties was vital because its solution was to determine the status of what was for some critical years the whole of the coloured population of British South Africa. The attitude shown by the colonists to coloured races, in the days before the twentieth-century fear of the superiority of the backward races had become a distorting influence, is instructive in its simplicity. One leading characteristic was a profound belief in the efficacy, and indeed in the necessity, of restrictions on people of colour. 'Passes' given or withheld by the 'master,' to limit and control their freedom of movement, were the keystone of the arch in the system. Measures for the betterment of the coloured races must always be kept in strict subordination to the supreme necessity for making their labour as cheap and plentiful as possible for work on the farms. There must also be provisions against 'vagrancy' and 'vagabondage'; and 'apprentice' laws for the better 'control' of the children. In all this there was little place for positive or constructive plans. The idea of any separate development of native life was undreamt

[1] Professor of Economics, Witwatersrand University, Johannesburg.

of. If only the (missionary) institutions which 'harboured' them had been broken up, and the whole Hottentot population dispersed among the farmers, the colonists would have rejoiced. . . . In principle, and even in details like the belief in restricted Pass Laws, the attitude of a hundred years ago still lives, bound up with a new element, the fear of preponderating numbers. . . . Any plan of real reform is blocked with mountains of obstruction from those whose notions of colour policy are even yet summed up in the demand that the dark races should be taught to know their place, and kept there. That place has never yet been defined, and as commonly used the term can only mean something indistinguishable from the old status of slavery. The Government had always to reckon with the clamorous demand for labour, *and was itself honestly of opinion that the economic prosperity of the country depended upon the services of the Hottentots.* All its laws, therefore, were two-edged. In making well-meant efforts for the legal protection of the Hottentots, they had at the same time, almost *pari passu*, been building up a host of provisions to drive them into service, and to keep them there."

The foregoing and much of what follows will be recognised as a close anticipation of policy in Kenya to-day.

"Hottentots and their dwellings were therefore to be registered (finger-printing had not yet been invented), contracts of service were to be entered upon in the presence of Landdrost. It was laid down that wages must be duly paid, etc., etc.

"The pivot of the whole system was the Pass Law. To check 'vagrancy' it was laid down that no Hottentot should move about the country without a pass from the Landdrost or field-cornet. In practice, he would need a pass from his employer to leave the farm even to go to a field-cornet, without whose authority he could not leave the 'ward'; to move to another district might need the authority of the Landdrost. Any Hottentot failing to produce this pass, which might or even should be demanded by any passing European,

was liable to be apprehended as a vagrant, and dealt with by the local authorities after due inquiry as they should feel incumbent to do. This meant that he would be contracted to some farmer wanting labour.

"Since it appeared that farmers had no interest whatever in young Hottentots, 'many of whom, although free in name are more dependent and more to be pitied than slaves,' in 1812 the Landdrosts were empowered to apprentice the Hottentot children from their eighth year to the eighteenth. Apprenticeship, of course, implied servantship."

We see to-day this philanthropic system which, after a protracted struggle, was abolished in the Cape Colony, as a result of the scandals which it created, now in active course of revival in Southern Rhodesia, at the instance of the farmers themselves, who need child-workers for the growing tobacco industry. The delusion that it is a kindness to the children will always revive when child labour is valuable.

The whole system of the Pass Laws and child apprenticeship was done away with in the Cape Colony during the early part of the period of Liberal Imperialism, and has never there been revived. It has since been established in Natal, the Transvaal, and the Orange Free State, Southern Rhodesia, and most lately and most scientifically in Kenya on precisely the same excuses and with precisely the same actually operative motives as those which underlay it in the Cape Colony.

Mr Macmillan observes:

"In the Union of to-day the old tradition of native policy has taken a new lease of life. The complaints of vagrancy and Bantu idleness, with plans to secure to farmers the control of their squatters, are almost indistinguishable from those against the Hottentots of a century ago. But indirectly the champions of a new-old view offer a triumphant testimony to the success of the full political and economic equality of the Cape policy, which, in spite of fears, has never threatened the leadership of the white race. Like the ancient prophet, they bless what they came to curse;

for they expressly recognise that the coloured people —the old Hottentots—have risen in a bare century from what they were in the days of Vagrancy Laws to the status of a civilised people."

The reference is, of course, to General Hertzog's [1] programme of native bills which proposed to release the coloured people from the disabilities they are still under in the Northern provinces, but to bring the Cape natives back under the same disabilities and restrictions as are now imposed on the natives of those other provinces.

> "South Africa threatens in its blindness to turn its back on the ripest fruit of its own experience, and to seek to settle its more complex Bantu problem by methods subversive of all the experience gained in the smaller but essentially similar question of the disposal of the Hottentots."

Although it is in the territories occupied by the emigrant Boers after they left the Cape Colony in protest against the liberalising proceedings of British government there that the Pass Laws have been revived, it would be an error to attribute this reversion to the South African farmers of the characteristic trekking class. I have already observed that the Boer economic system was less onerous to natives regarded as labour than a plantation system or the developing intensive agriculture of the Cape and Natal farmers. The reintroduction of Pass Laws into the Northern Provinces was due to the demands of white capital in its most characteristic form.

In 1895 the Chamber of Mines of Johannesburg complained to the Volksraad—the then Parliament of the Transvaal—that the gold mining companies had difficulties —owing to the absence of adequate legal powers—in enforcing the performance of contracts of natives employed in the mines. Offers had been made to bring natives from a distance under twelve months' contracts, and at wages of 35s. per month. Seeing that the rate at that time, as now, was 60s. per month, the proposition was tempting, but the natives had to be kept when caught. The Chamber of

[1] For full particulars see *The Anatomy of African Misery*.

Mines drafted Pass regulations and handed them to the Government of the South African Republic. On the basis of these regulations and with the sanction, after the South African War, of British authority, the native workers are domiciled in enclosed compounds to which they are required to return at the curfew hour, and elaborate measures are taken for securing their identification and for preventing employers engaging natives who cannot show a discharge from a previous employer.

The policy has been developed and perfected both in the Northern Provinces and in Natal. Any native may be stopped by any white man, his pass demanded, and he may be committed to prison if he cannot produce it and show legal authority for his being where he happens to be.

A joint memorandum presented to the Government relative to the Pass Laws was lately drawn up by a Committee representing the (Native) Industrial and Commercial Workers' Union, the African National Congress, the Johannesburg and Pretoria Joint Councils of Europeans and Natives, and the South African Non-European Federation of Trade Unions, associated with other prominent Europeans of liberal views. After calling attention to the most mischievous and oppressive features of the existing laws, the memorandum points out that in the Cape Province, where the Pass system is not in operation, crime and vagrancy among the native population are far less common than in the Transvaal with its elaborate Pass system, which indeed is easily evaded by the criminal type of native which it is supposed to control.

> "The repeal of the Pass Laws would be greeted by the whole Bantu population with enthusiastic gratitude . . . the atmosphere of goodwill and friendship which such an action would create would be beneficial beyond words to the problems of race contact which are crying out for solution. . . . The withdrawal of these laws would remove a long-standing grievance amongst natives and a direct incentive to dishonesty on their part."

CHAPTER XXIII

THE IMPOSSIBILITY OF REPRESSIONISM

In divers mixed communities at successive periods the political doctrine that white men have rights superior to those of black has been asserted and acted upon. The doctrine has never stood unchallenged; it has constantly suffered defeat, and where it still asserts itself is continually being attacked and shaken. No one in the British West Indian colonies would now propound that black and coloured men may be dealt with on different principles from white men in regard to political and industrial rights. Concurrently with the assertion of this discriminatory political doctrine and its recurrent defeats there has emerged a corresponding ethical doctrine that the white man has philanthropic duties towards the black which he is morally and religiously bound to discharge for the latter's benefit, by educating him, as the adult educates the child, and that this duty of education can be best pursued by dealing with him in what turns out to be very much the same manner as it has been the fashion to deal with him in for the purposes of the white man on the theory that the latter had a right to his services—that is to say, by making him work in the white man's methods. This ethical formulation of the theory of the proper relations of white and black has also continuously and repeatedly suffered defeat and discredit, from the same causes as has the theory of unequal rights.

The reason for the insecurity of the theory that the white man has superior rights is twofold. First, that it is contrary to the profoundest convictions and sentiments of large and continuously influential classes among the white peoples, who recognise in it both a denial of human rights and an apostasy from the principles of their religions,

especially Christianity. Missionary churches have therefore, necessarily, continuously set their faces against it: and missionary influence has been powerful in all the mixed communities in which the theory operates. Indeed, in some of these the missionary contact has preceded the secular, industrial, and commercial contacts in whose service the theory of unequal rights is invoked. The theory not only subserves the desire of the white man to make use of the services of the black for his profit, whether in slavery or in more civilised forms of exploitation, but also furnishes justifications for oppressive proceedings to help the European to hold his position among populations upon whose rights and customs of livelihood he is encroaching or by which his own asserted rights are threatened or alleged to be threatened. All students of South African history will remember the record of the struggle between the Christian and liberal ethic and this pragmatic and utilitarian ethic of the farming and pioneering settlers. In the Cape Colony the Christian and liberal ethic prevailed. Admission of equal rights was won for the Hottentots, the Cape coloured people, and the remnants of the Bushmen, the enslavement of their children under the name of apprenticeship was repressed. Wherever a society of Europeans carries with it the traditions of Christendom, the defeat of the doctrine of unequal rights is latent and implicit in that society so long as Christianity is truly represented in its Churches, even though the conventional local church doctrine may accommodate itself, as that of the Established Anglican Church did in the West Indies, and as that of the Dutch Reformed Church in South Africa has done, to the secular doctrine, and even though contemporary Churchmen may, as did the Bishops of Mombasa and Kikuyu, propound that it would be good to impose compulsory labour upon their native flocks.

The second reason is that no race or people, preserving the adaptable vitality of humanity, will continuously consent to give in to such a theory of society, least of all when the recognised representatives in their own country of the intelligence and religion of the civilised world are on their side, and their education assists them. The refusal to put up with such conditions operates diversely. The black or

coloured people whom it is desired to enslave, exploit, or treat as a caste of inferior rights may, as has happened in some instances, simply perish and disappear. The Indian races of America refused amalgamation into white society on the terms of that ethic. The Arawaks of the West Indies, the Tasmanian natives, and the bulk of the Australian natives died out in face of it. The Africans and the people of mixed African blood throughout the formerly Spanish and Portuguese-American countries have asserted and established their claim to equality. The negro in the United States of America is steadily pushing it. Of the situation in the West Indies I have spoken. The natives of West Africa are secure in their own racial pride and in the greater consistency of European policy in regard to them. Only in South Africa and those regions in South and South-Eastern Africa which the still persistently surviving Afrikander dogma of unequal rights has influenced does it appear effectually dominant. Appearances even there are deceptive; and are much more surely deceptive to-day than they could have been considered a generation ago. Two wars have set the landslide in motion. The effects of the South African War were profoundly disturbing. It was those effects that gave rise to the sittings of the South African Native Commission of 1905, whose report I have quoted so freely. The outcome of that report was General Botha's Native Land Bill, professedly an assertion of native rights not adequately acknowledged. In earlier chapters and more fully in *The Anatomy of African Misery* I have traced the sequels of that enactment. They are still developing. Unfortunately, no such allotment of lands as General Botha had promised has been arrived at; only increased and continuing controversy, and an aggravation of native grievances which is marshalling an increasingly distinct confrontation of black against white. The European War also energetically loosened the equilibrium. Thanks to the experiences imposed on the native by these events and controversies and to the continual stimulus of the conditions of the industrial life of the mines and the cities, through which so many hundreds of thousands of natives perpetually pass (some five hundred thousand remaining a permanently detribalised population, continually in contact with all the

stresses of white industrial life), an immense education in the elements of the theory of interracial relations has been diffused among Africans, who are capable of thinking and arguing just as pointedly as any white man about the significance and the politics of their immediate industrial circumstances. The elementary facts of the situation are very simple, and it is not only the South African industrial worker that has been compelled to realise them. The natives of Rhodesia, Nyasaland, and Kenya are capable of realising them too, and they increasingly do so.

The method in which the determination of Africans not to put up with a theory of unequal rights is manifesting itself in South Africa has been determined, as is not surprising, rather in the world of industrial relations than in those of politics. There has recently been a double attack on native equality of rights, in the proposal to abolish the Cape Native Franchise and in the Industrial Colour-Bar Bill of 1926. The threat to the Cape Native Franchise does not directly affect natives outside of the Cape Native Province, but it has been vehemently denounced by their spokesmen as a violation of expectations which they were entitled to entertain as British subjects, under the guarantees which the Imperial Government purported to maintain on their behalf in the constitution of the South African Union.

But the Colour-Bar Law was a direct declaration of a war of industrial repression on the part of the white worker against the black, and it has produced its own appropriate and quite unexceptionable response in the organisation with rapidly increasing membership of the "Industrial and Commercial Workers Union." This is an organisation, now said to have about a hundred thousand members, the constituents of which repudiate the Colour-Bar principle by adopting in all respects the lines of self-help characteristic of the white industrial world. They form a Trade Union organised on the principles of British Industrial Unions, with the encouragement and advice and assistance from the British Trades Union Council. They apply to the white Unions for association in the South African Trade Union organisation for affiliation to and co-operation with it. And under the constitution of the International Labour

Office of the League of Nations they have as good a right to be considered as representatives of South African workers as that of the representatives of the white Trade Unions. The League of Nations, and its associate the International Labour Office, know nothing and can take no cognisance of any discrimination of industrial rights between organised workers on the ground of difference of race.

It would be an insane and desperate undertaking for native discontent in South Africa to organise any attempt at rebellious violence, although a good many South African farmers, especially in Natal, by dismissing from their employment and evicting from their houses (which they burnt) natives who had joined the I.C.U., have given great provocation to violent reprisals. But a general strike of unskilled South African labourers would no doubt be much more feasible than a general strike of wage-workers in a European country, and, because of the practical dependence of the white community upon black men for all manual and unskilled labour would, if it were organised, be much more powerfully effective; for white men are not available to take the place of black in the services which the latter perform in even a fraction of the degree to which it was possible in the British General Strike of 1926 to find substitutes for British skilled workers.

Indeed, it is due to the recognition of this important fact that the Labour Laws of South Africa are so stringent. There are no free labourers in South Africa. All natives are employed under the Masters' and Servants' Laws, and it is a penal offence to strike. Organised native labour in South Africa has therefore not the weapon available to European wage-workers of refusing to work with impunity. Such refusal is legally criminal. The policy of the South African Government in the Native Land Bill recently proposed was to force an increased number of natives under the provisions of the Masters' and Servants' Laws, by making it illegal for any native to be resident on land not his own unless he were either a labour tenant or a bonded labourer, whilst at the same time abstaining from fulfilling the promise of General Botha's Land Act that native claims to land should be satisfied.

It is, however, a significant and encouraging symptom

of developments that are even now taking place in South African opinion about the position of the native in industry and in politics, that the result of the consideration by the Select Committee of Parliament of the unenacted residue of General Hertzog's budget of Native Affairs Bills (after the Native Affairs Regulation Law and the Colour-Bar Law, which were part of the bargain struck by General Hertzog with the European Labour Party for their political support, had been duly forced through Parliament) has been that the other Bills have been hung up, and will probably not be proceeded with until after a General Election. This decision was doubtless due to the obvious force of the evidence given upon those Bills before the Select Committeee. No impartial critic reading that evidence could fail to be impressed by the overwhelming preponderance of temperate, intelligent, and rational criticism of the Bills' defects and injustices over the pessimistic or cynical apologies made for them as a forlorn hope for keeping the native in his place of subordination to the European, both industrially and politically, on the plea of the necessity of safeguarding European civilisation. I have in *The Anatomy of African Misery* argued the injustice and folly of the proposal to disfranchise the Cape natives, and the illusory and treacherous character of the provisions ostensibly offered for enabling the natives to procure more lands for their own. I also there analysed the oppressiveness of the attack on what is called squatting, namely, the permitted occupation by natives of lands once their own, but appropriated by Europeans, and (in view of the intended effects of this land legislation) the industrial selfishness of the project of denying any native, not an owner of land, to be resident anywhere in the Union (outside of towns) except as a bonded servant under the Masters' and Servants' Laws. These are, as a European [1] witness before the Select Committee observed, a form of slavery: the native being liable to criminal penalties if he leaves his employment, and being hampered by the Native Affairs Regulation Law of 1926 from combining for his industrial advantage.

[1] Not an official or "intellectual" but representing a large landowning syndicate.

CHAPTER XXIV

THE NEW DEPARTURE OF 1919

In the Covenant of the League of Nations it was agreed that the proper position of a European Power exercising dominion in Africa is that of a trustee for the native inhabitants. If it had been intended by the Covenant's framers to suggest that this proposition described conditions then existing, or that it pledged their Governments to its literal application in future, it would have been a most egregious feat of diplomatic humbug. No European Power has ever exercised or is ever likely to exercise dominion in Africa exclusively as a trustee for natives. It will always be there, in large measure, for the purpose of assisting the economic supply of European needs by the exchange of commodities produced by African labour for commodities produced in Europe. In order to promote the increase of such production, which unquestionably may be encouraged with advantages to the natives, as we see in West Africa in regard to cocoa, ground nuts, palm and coconut oil, cotton, and other staples, the interests of a considerable number of Europeans to promote and assist in this production and trade may reasonably and indeed must necessarily be regarded as part of the trust. And this activity will actually be promoted in the interests of European investors of capital, equally, under existing conditions, indispensable, and it will be so promoted quite independently of any interest felt in the natives, and by Europeans who know and care nothing about them. Further, if Europeans can make good as ranchers and planters in Africa, without encroachment on the personal rights or social interests of the natives, which can be the case if the natives are allowed to keep their land and to develop their own production, it is all to the benefit of the world, European and African both,

that such intercourse should be established. Whether it can be established upon these terms is a question the decision of which is still being dealt with in an experimental stage. It has hardly yet been given a fair trial, because in all these communities the pioneer settlers have, as I have shown by quotations from leading spirits among them, and by references to their administrative proceedings, maintained and acted upon the doctrine that it cannot be established on those fair terms, have accordingly disregarded the rights of the natives, and have so dealt with them as to engender antagonism between black and white. As the recent Land Commission of Southern Rhodesia in its Report very straightforwardly says, with pointed reference to their South African neighbours,

> "*In the world generally the relations between the white and coloured races tend to become more and more embittered; and of those who have given the subject most thought, many fear that wars of extermination between the races will take place in the future unless every effort is made to secure a better understanding between them.*"

That is the result of the "European" policy of development as observed by Rhodesians themselves in Southern Rhodesia, and combined with that policy among the causes of that increasing hostility is the Africander policy embodied in the recent Colour-Bar Law of the South African Union. The Colour-Bar Law is not restricted to the gold-mining industry, but may be applied at the pleasure of the South African Minister of Industry to any and every industry using machinery, for example, all workshops and factories, sugar mills, brick and lime works, etc., etc. It is true that General Hertzog declared that there was no immediate intention of applying it to any other use of machinery than that *to which it is now practically applied by custom*—that is to say, the mechanical industry of the Rand Mines. His announcement, however, was promptly stultified by an attempt to apply it to the driving of motor cars by natives. The Courts declared this illegal, as they had previously declared a colour-bar order illegal in mines. Such defects in the law can be just as easily remedied in

the one case as in the other, and it is already demanded that this should be done. But even if, because of established custom, the positive and substantial grievance of the native is not immediately increased by the law, it is, as a gesture and as an enunciation of principle, a declaration of an extremely serious character. It is a warning to the whole of native Africa that this European State has decided to proclaim it legitimate to keep them as unskilled labourers, whether they are living in reserves or whether, as many of them must necessarily be, they are living as normal citizens of a mixed community. It is an aggravation of the political discrimination embodied in their exclusion from the political franchise. And if it should be fully extended, as it has already been sought to extend it, to the industrial life of a mixed community in which they are increasingly taking their part as skilled workers, it would effect gross economic oppression and would reinforce the outspoken design of the party of white ascendancy and repression to keep the native as a serf and a bondman in his own country and not to allow him education and opportunity of development in the essential activities of that society which rests on the broad basis of his manual toil.

This particular scandal and danger, however, has arisen as yet principally within the sphere of the South African Union Government alone, which cannot be affected by any political or ministerial action in this country. It is possible, at any rate in the more Northern territories, still nominally controlled by the Colonial Office, or nominally administered by it as trustee for the natives under mandate of the League of Nations, for the British Government to withstand any extension or acceptance of this poisonous principle.

In the territories in which European settlement is principally commercial or agricultural the problem of relations between Europeans and natives is fundamentally simple if ordinary considerations of justice are observed. Unfortunately, European immigrants are too often quickly indoctrinated with the local theory that the rights of coloured people may reasonably be dealt with on different principles from the rights of Europeans, and that modes of dealing with fellow-humans which the civilisation in

which they were bred has repudiated may properly be applied in African territories. The fundamental right of African natives in contact with Europeans is that they should not be forced by duress to work for the latter's profit, and to secure this right it is necessary that their land should be reserved in their ownership, or where white men are overrunning the country and entrapping or cajoling natives into disadvantageous and unfair bargains, that the lands and other essential interests of the natives shall be protected against the legal crafts of the white man by the establishment of State trusts for the natives, to hold their lands for them, and of departments of native affairs, entirely independent of interference from the white man's elected assemblies, the franchise to which he keeps in his own hands. This intermediate stage of protective trusteeship must be maintained so long as the native is incapable of looking after his own interests through the exercise of a political vote. Meanwhile the function of Government in regard to natives, through the Native Affairs Departments, should be to extend to them all possible means of economic as well as intellectual education.

Where, however, there is a white wage-earning class or a class of poor whites who compete in the labour market with Africans, the problem is complicated, and in its early stages gives rise to such desperate expedients as the attempt to exclude natives from occupations for which the white man considers himself to be suited. In any white community dependent on low-paid coloured labour such a class of "poor whites" invariably and inevitably arises. It is already springing up in Kenya. There are many white "unemployed" to-day in Nairobi.

The question of industrial relations in Africa has been so much disturbed by the increasing difficulties of this poor-white class that the time is ripe for an inquiry under the auspices of the International Labour Office as to what lines of policy ought to be pursued by European Imperial Powers in regard to these matters. The League of Nations has already been conducting a special inquiry into the extent of the survival of actual slavery in African and other communities. But the special commission for that inquiry decided that even such questions as that of forced labour

for public purposes were not strictly within its province, that the question of indentured labour was quite outside of it, and that the question of discriminating legislation debarring natives from certain forms of employment was also beyond its scope. The International Labour Office has now approved of a project for setting up a Committee to deal with all these questions, to formulate what it is to be hoped may serve as a Charter for coloured labour in its relation with white communities.

The field to be surveyed is exceedingly wide and the conditions prevailing in different parts of it very diverse, so that hardly any general proposition can be laid down which would be equally applicable everywhere. More than this, the degree to which the power of the British Government, however directed, can come into action is equally diverse, and is, in fact, least in such territories as that of the South African Union, where the difficulties are greatest and where the dangers which are developing in the relations between white and black are most threatening.

The Covenant of the League of Nations also established the invention of "Mandates" to be applied to backward countries over which European nations had assumed sovereignty, especially in regard to territories in Africa formerly part of the German Empire. These mandates were in Africa of two classes. In what was formerly German South-West Africa a "Class A" mandate was given to the Government of the South African Union: that is to say, that territory was practically annexed to the Union and placed directly under its government. The Cameroons, German Congo, and Tanganyika were dealt with under "Class B" mandates: that is to say, they were placed under the direct government of France, England, and Belgium respectively. In each case it was duly prescribed that the territories were to be administered as a trust on behalf of the native inhabitants, and that equal opportunities for trade and enterprise were to be allowed to the nationals of all members of the League. The only means of control over the administration left in the hands of the League lay in the requirement that reports should be annually rendered to it by the Mandatory Government to be dealt with by its permanent Commission on Mandates.

This control is in practice of a somewhat shadowy order. It has already failed to prevent such scandals as the punishment by massacre of Hottentot discontent in South-West Africa, but in that instance the resulting inquiry by the Mandates Commission had unquestionably a wholesome effect. The criticism for which the annual assembly of the League of Nations gives opportunity and the continuous work of the Mandates Commission can and probably will, in course of time, be made to exercise a stronger influence than they at present do in guiding the development of native policy on the principles desired by those who inspired the framing of the Covenant of the League. But more is required, and, if those purposes are to be continuously kept in view, it is necessary that the League itself should have representatives domiciled in those territories to watch and report to it, and that there should be some means of direct appeal to the League on behalf of the natives against any failure of the mandated Government to act in accordance with its trust. It need hardly be said that such intervention would be strongly resisted by the mandatory Powers concerned. The British and Belgian Governments have expressly rebuffed it; but it is an aim which will have to be pressed for.

Both in mandated territories and in British possessions under direct sovereignty, as well as more recently in the South African Union, there are Public Departments of Native Affairs established for safeguarding the interests of the natives. The officers of these departments cannot generally be charged with having shown lack of zeal in their task. But they are subordinates of the local Government, and according to the temper and purposes of each local Government their activities are encouraged or repressed. Whether a Government is actuated by the idea of developing its territories directly in the interests of Europeans, as now in South Africa, or as in Rhodesia of Europeans and natives jointly, or even as nominally in Tanganyika in the paramount interests of the natives; if that Government entertains the theory, which has been strongly entertained by Lord Milner and other British statesmen who have guided Imperial policy, that such interests can be best developed by capitalist enterprise offering employment to natives,

then the Native Affairs Department will have a continuous uphill struggle, because whatever may be the theory and avowed goodwill of the Government towards natives, the persons actually engaged in the work of capitalist development will inevitably pursue their task from the point of view of capitalist employers, and partly from this belief in their own system, and partly through ignorance of the merits of the point of view of the native and the Native Affairs Department, will influence the policy of the Government against the liberty and interests of the natives. They do so now.

The intelligence and temperament of the African native people do not take congenially to the principles of the capitalist system. From the point of view of their standards, as of those of China and India, they are barbarous and immoral. In point of fact, negro racials are conspicuously endowed with excellent human qualities which the capitalist system tends to impair, as it has impaired them in Europe, and which, if allowed to operate under enlightened guidance in their own tribal economy, would produce a better and happier kind of native community than engrossment in a capitalist system of industry which has produced 1,350,000 unemployed in its own champion sphere of development can possibly do. The Colonial Office has in times past been the only institution which has been sufficiently strong to assist in the maintenance or protection of native rights, but when the modern policy of capitalist development in South and East Africa superseded the old commercial policy of the West African colonies, the Colonial Office largely abdicated its functions in that regard, on the theory that public-spirited and upright Englishmen might be trusted to see that native rights were not encroached on and that "the man on the spot" must have "a free hand." Unfortunately the Africander theory of the relative rights of white men and natives has spread northwards, and combines with the theory of benevolent capitalism to neutralise efforts of policy based on considerations of native rights and the native temperament. The continuous discussions which have taken place in recent years about the clash of these two policies in Kenya is, it may be hoped, reinforcing insistence upon the principle that colonisation must not

be allowed to infringe native rights and to become a mere engine of exploitation. Perpetual vigilance both in this country and on the part of the Mandates Commission of the League of Nations may do much to check the encroachments of capitalist methods in Africa and to promote the development, which must be gradual and cannot be hurried, of capable industrious native communities using in their own methods the scientific and economic inventions of Europe.

In recent years the Government of the South African Union has been desirous of incorporating Rhodesia and the territories of Bechuanaland, Basutoland, and Swaziland. In the interests of the natives of those countries, and in the interest of both white and native inhabitants of Rhodesia, any such extension of the domain of Africanderism would be disastrous. It is regrettable that German South-West Africa was made a territory of the Union. It would be absurd, notwithstanding the language of the Covenant, to suggest that this was done in the interests of the natives. In view of the part taken by the Union Government in the War, their desire that this territory should be given them could not be resisted. The native policy lately adopted by the Union Government is a menace to Africa and the world, and if the Government of this country have any means of resisting the extension of the sphere of its influence it is their duty to the world to do so.

That native communities, within the boundaries of the South African Union, have gained substantial benefits from white colonisation can hardly be disputed. Especially was this so in the Cape Colony when the principles of the Second Colonial Period effectually made their way. No rehearsal of such benefits, however, can justify continued injustice to and repression of native peoples. The tendency to injustice and repression is gaining ground, because many whites in South Africa are conceiving a dread that the natives will increase too rapidly to be held in check, and will "submerge white civilisation." This is at present still a chimerical fear; the tendency to injustice and repression may well make it a real one. Prudent and intelligent administration in Rhodesia, Tanganyika, Kenya, and similar

territories may yet prove that the idea of the Covenant of the League of Nations is practicable, and that European colonisation of Africa can be administered in such a way as to develop the best faculties of African races and to assist them to develop the resources of their own country with mutual profit to Europe and Africa.

CHAPTER XXV

THE DOCTRINE OF TRUSTEESHIP

The practice of speaking of European Imperial Powers as "trustees" for "backward peoples" has now become widely familiar. Its popular vogue derives from the Covenant of the League of Nations, though it had long previously been used of British rule in India. The Covenant gave the conception a certain formal reality. Written instruments were drawn up, and approved by the Council of the League, purporting to be statements of obligations undertaken by certain among the victorious Allied Powers as "Mandatories"—for what were formerly German possessions. The duties of the Mandatory Powers were indicated, more or less explicitly, in those documents. The idea made way, and British statesmen began to talk, at least metaphorically, of the British Imperial Government as exercising "trusteeship for natives" in our own unmandated Colonies and Protectorates also. The idea is a gracious one; the habit of so thinking of ourselves is comfortable to our self-respect. Sincerely apprehended and applied it can be wholesome; its implications appear more genteel and less commercial than those of the nineteenth-century doctrine of "undeveloped Imperial estates." But it conceals pitfalls. The duties and implications of our self-attributed trusts are not defined. There are no agreed documents of the character of trust deeds, as there are in the case of the mandates. There is nothing analogous to a Court of Chancery to interpret the trust and protect its beneficiaries as there is, at least ostensibly, in the League's Commission for Mandates. The doctrine implies little more than an attitude which, it is assumed, humane and disinterested folk of British traditions (commonly spoken of as "idealists" when any practical issue arises) would desire that we

should observe. Parliamentary vigilance, directed by public opinion, is its only safeguard. And it may be questioned what reason there is for confidence that this safeguard will operate more effectually now than it used to during the Second Period of Colonial Policy, before we talked of trusteeship, and when we simply relied on what Englishmen, informed by an open Press, understood as the common rules of civilised Christian behaviour. Exeter Hall having now become the Strand Palace Hotel, and most of our Press being still of the Chamberlain-Kipling philosophy, the preaching of trusteeship, assuming proper definition of principles and disinterested administration, no doubt goes some way towards providing a substitute for those weakened defences of humanism.

Unfortunately, "trusteeship" without a trust deed or a Court is a "blessed word" very easy to juggle with. The present Secretary of State for Dominions made recently a new departure in regard to East Africa, by issuing a White Paper [1] amending the declaration of the principles of British trusteeship for Africans made in the Kenya White Paper [2] of 1923 (after the tussle above recorded over forced native labour and Indians' rights), and his indications of the mode of application of the doctrine of trusteeship which he desired Sir E. Hilton Young's East African Commission to elaborate strikingly illustrate the facility of such jugglery.

The White Paper of 1923 declared that "His Majesty's Government regarded *themselves* as exercising a trust on behalf of the African population," that in the exercise of that trust "the interests of the African natives must be paramount, and that if, and when, those interests and the interests of the immigrant races should conflict, the former should prevail." I myself have often wondered whether these finely conceived phrases were not, perhaps, a little over-enthusiastic and even injudicious. Imperialist real-politicians and East Africa pioneers smiled complacently at them as transparent but harmless bunkum. Harmless, at any rate, so long as their friends might be in power. But the portent of a Labour Government disturbed their complacency. "The next Labour Government," they said,

[1] [Cmd. 2904.]
[2] [Cmd. 1922.]

"will restore Tanganyika to Germany. It will establish native Soviets. Entrust us with East Africa." Hence Mr Amery's appointment of the East African Federation Commission. Outside of Basutoland, Bechuanaland, and Swaziland (which it has been assumed are to join the happy family of the South African Union), it was common knowledge that no African territory had been annexed by Great Britain for the purpose of an administrative crusade addressed to the study of the paramount interests of African natives, and that, except missionaries and perhaps a few public officials, no European had ever entered any such territory because he desired to devote his life to those interests, or was occupied in pursuing them, and that, so far, no Government of any British East African territory, least of all that of Kenya, had been administered with that object regarded as paramount. (Tanganyika, of course, stands by itself, but even in regard to Tanganyika the idea has not been general in this country.) On the contrary, the Imperially-thinking public had always been encouraged to understand that the justification of our assuming these new dominions was that they would provide raw materials and tropical products for British manufactures and trade, and new homes for Englishmen. And their progress had been annually impressed on that public by reports showing the quantities and values of such exports produced through the activities of such Englishmen. All very gratifying, no doubt, but not suggesting consciousness of the paramountcy of native interests, about which the reports said very little, and that little habitually ignored in our press, which knows what interests its readers.

"This paramount duty of trusteeship," the Duke of Devonshire stated, "will continue, as in the past, to be carried out under the Secretary of State for the Colonies by the agents of the Imperial Government, *and by them alone*." But in the White Paper of July 1927 Mr Amery watered down this pronouncement. He said: "While these responsibilities of trusteeship must *for some considerable time* rest *mainly* on the agents of the Imperial Government, the time has now come to associate more closely in this high and honourable task those who, as colonists and residents, have identified their interests with the

prosperity of the country." Now, as any solicitor would explain to us, a trustee cannot have an unlimited personal interest in the trust property; nor can he delegate or divide his trust. He remains solely responsible. Manifestly, if we are bound by principles of trusteeship, the duties of Britain under the Tanganyika mandate cannot be so delegated or shared. The British Imperial Government alone is responsible to the authority (wherever that now resides) that created that trust. Outside the mandated territory, however, any British Government is at liberty to interpret the self-assigned trusteeship which we now advertise just as it pleases: the advertisement is merely a metaphorical declaration of good intentions. The elasticity of its interpretation accommodates itself to the views of the Minister and the mood of the Parliament of the day. The term "trusteeship" is, in fact, in this White Paper of Mr Amery's, used ambiguously and unperspicaciously, if not with conscious equivocation, in two distinct senses.

I myself am disposed to think that we could afford to dispense with some of the propagation of the gospel of trusteeship in exchange for a revival of livelier insistence by British opinion, and more uncompromising instructions to governors by the Colonial Office that British Colonial Government is to adhere to the principles which it observed in the Victorian Age or Second Colonial Period of our Empire, before the vogue of the doctrine that the promotion of capitalistic exploitation of our undeveloped estates was a public duty.

As to the principles of trusteeship which would commend themselves to those leading politicians of Kenya whom Mr Amery proposes to associate in his own trust, they are exhibited very fully and with detailed view in Dr Leys's *Kenya* and Mr M'Gregor Ross's *Kenya from Within*, as well as in the documents I have myself quoted. There is the record; and the policy which it exhibits, which has reflected, no doubt, the sincere convictions of those who pushed it as both patriotic and of human advantage, has certainly not been deemed by them so discreditable as to constitute any reference to it an injustice. I have quoted Lord Delamere's succinct condensation of it in his evidence on the Native Reserve question. That is precisely

what Mrs Buxton tells us is the view of many settlers. Such quotations could be multiplied. Major Grogan, a very influential politician in Kenya, recently a member of the legislature and now a candidate, has expressed it with the vigour which his record would lead us to expect from him:

> "A good sound system of compulsory labour would do more to raise the nigger in five years than all the millions that have been sunk in missionary efforts for the last fifty. . . . Let the native be compelled to work so many months in the year and call it compulsory education, as we call our weekly bonnet parades Church. Under such a title, surely the most delicate British conscience may be at rest." [1]

In the *East African Standard* of Feb. 16, 1926, there is a report of a speech by Captain Coney, member of the Legislative Council, the following extract from which is equally significant:—

> "The position of the labour market was really serious. 'You will never solve the problem until you have control of the country—when you have that you will immediately solve the problem.'
>
> "The policy of the Government should be that every male native of the country must work. Could the meeting define to him how that policy could be enforced? Did the meeting suggest for a moment that Government could force labour? He thought that all the Government could say was this: 'You must work —either in the reserves or on the farms, but work you must.' If that policy were to be applied they would have the politicians at home determined 'to do us in.' There was no solution except to get control of the country in our own hands."

The dilution of British ideas of trusteeship for Africans with those of their highly representative "colonists and residents" does not offer a very inviting prospect for native Africans.

The British Parliament—and therefore British public opinion—is still constitutionally responsible for controlling

[1] E. S. (late Major) Grogan, *From the Cape to Cairo*, p. 360.

policy affecting African natives, not only in Kenya but elsewhere also outside the boundaries of the South African Union. Information and discussion about such policy, in our Press and in Parliament, are therefore essential, especially when the question of "devolving trusteeship" is being mooted. Impatience, however, is often manifested on behalf of British colonists in Africa at any criticisms of acts of policy or advocacy of policy embodying local views, such as those which I have just quoted, discordant from British traditions of proper dealings with natives. This tone of protest was echoed by Mr Baldwin in Parliament not long ago. "We should not act," he said, "on the assumption that our people when they had to deal with such questions in a distant country had not the same sense of honour and decency that they had in this country." Those who in this country raise questions about features of local native policy in regard to which we have this responsibility are lectured as enemies of our countrymen, incapable of seeing good in anything that white men do in Africa. Unfortunately, no one who has acquaintance or correspondence with South and East Africa, or sees its newspapers, or has watched the currents of local public opinion can be under any illusion that, even in a country regarded as so British in tone as Southern Rhodesia, the balance of public opinion as to what is "decent" behaviour towards Africans is the same as it is in this country, or that where it differs it differs in all respects admirably.

For example, in September 1927, a British Southern Rhodesian farmer, of good position, was sent to prison for fifteen months for torturing his black servant (in order to extract a confession of suspected theft) by branding him with a red-hot iron, tying him up to a beam for twenty-four hours, and then again branding him. Fellow-servants were compelled to hold the man down. The atrocity created locally, no doubt, much indignation and horror. And we have perhaps as cruelly disposed people in this country. Cases of gross cruelty to children come from time to time into our Police Courts. But it is inconceivable that any such outrage as this could have been openly carried out by an English farmer upon a ploughboy suspected of pilfering.

The following letter upon the subject, which speaks for itself, appeared in the *Rhodesia Herald*:—

"SIR,—If anyone should ask me to sign a petition for a pardon for Mr J. M. I would gladly do so.

"Like many others I consider his sentence an extremely stiff one. Even natives convicted of cruelty are given the option of a fine. One month's hard, or £3 fine, was the sentence given a native not so very long ago for excessive brutality to a valuable cow, causing her to die a painful death in spite of all that her owner could do.

"Mr M.'s case would probably never have occurred if our present system would only recognise the principle of corporal punishment, and would distinguish between that and assault. Give a magistrate the power to say to the chastised native: 'You deserved the beating your master has given you. If he has to beat you again I shall sentence you to ten cuts or £1, without option of going to gaol. Case dismissed.' The native would leave the Court keyed up to doing better, and would begin to respect his master. Better work and longer service would result. Instead of pushing farmers to such a state of exasperation that they nearly half-kill a native in trying to teach him to behave himself, how would it be to alter some of our more stupid laws?

"The Bible gives us instances of branding and beating human beings—when the Lord put a mark upon Cain, and when Christ made a scourge of small cords, with which He drove certain people out of the temple. If ten or fifteen cuts with a cane accompanied every sentence of imprisonment, natives would regard prisons as places to be avoided.

"As things are now, 'John' tells his 'missus' he is not afraid of the Magistrate, and doesn't mind being sent to gaol, where he gets plenty to eat and very little to do. Cattle are branded and rebranded. If it is so cruel for a man to brand a man, it is just as cruel for a man to brand cattle. Kaffirs brand their children and use knives on their small bodies. They beat their

wives whenever they want to, and sell their daughters for cattle. What is done about it? They are allowed to soak themselves in kaffir beer. Indeed, it seems they must have everything they don't deserve except the beating they do deserve.—I am, etc.,

"M. LOWICK.

"27 PARK STREET,
SALISBURY."

An English editor in this country would no doubt have enshrined such a letter in the "lunatic file." In Rhodesia it is not deemed too ruffianly or too ridiculous to be published as a contribution to public discussion. Those who hold such views are not as yet supreme as ruling in the white community, but they are many enough to have influence, and their habits of mind do not entirely fail to affect the tenor of legislation. Two recent local laws have included new sanctions for flogging natives. Mr Lowick's letter shows the kind of temperament and intelligence in which such proposals originate. It is by no means unfamiliar in England: but it does not here prevail so easily. I may add that Mr J. M., within six weeks of the date of his sentence, was released from further detention on a medical certificate of ill-health.

The Prime Minister of South Africa, about the same time, declared in a public speech, that "If attempts from oversea to interfere in South African native affairs do not stop, they may cost the Empire one day the greater part of what is to-day included in it in South Africa." The telegraphic report did not indicate what kind of interference General Hertzog had in his mind, but it is difficult to conceive of any interference now possible which could be affected by South African secession. We in this country cannot, at any rate, safely abstain from paying attention to South African local controversies on native affairs, from publicly commenting on them, and from drawing instruction from them for our own guidance in those other parts of Africa for which we are still responsible.

The most able and impressive local critics of the significance and tendency of recent native policy in the South African Union are fortunately themselves Europeans.

The Economic and Wages Commission of 1926 published in its Report and evidence the most cogent of arguments against the Colour-Bar Bill then in progress, the most illuminating commentary on South African labour policy, and the most penetrating analysis of the fallacies of the attitude of white men towards black which is characteristic of those sections of the Union population whom General Hertzog's Ministry specially represents. The spirit and tendencies of the policy now being pursued by his Government are certainly quite inconsistent with the traditions of the British Commonwealth. They constitute innovations made in the King's name discordant with what Africans have been solemnly promised by the King's predecessors, and explode what has hitherto been regarded, both by Englishmen and by Africans, as a fundamental principle of the King of England's dominions. They, and that circumstance, may be primarily South African concerns, but their development cannot fail to have important reactions upon the whole relations between the European and African worlds.

The necessity for criticism of them here arises from their manifest danger to British administration and influence in the rest of the British African Empire. Such criticisms therefore must needs continue to be made in this country, and they are likely to be increasingly made. They are very relevant to the question of transferring our responsibility to, or sharing it with, those whose views on native policy are so definite and so discordant from our own as is the European settlers' policy in Kenya, as hitherto promulgated and pressed.

CHAPTER XXVI

THE PILGRIMAGE OF A NEGRO PEASANTRY

Towards the close of the dry, when the rainy season is promised, and forgetful divinities are being importuned with incantations and drummings, or with petitions salvaged from the not yet Revised Anglican Prayer Book, red stars of fire by night and feathers of smoke by day spangle and blur the fringes of African woodlands, the thickets and bleached high grass of old ruinate clearings, and the long blue escarpments of Antillean mountain-sides. Deep in the latticed gloom of Central American forests, among the mounds of forgotten Babylons, unexpected illuminations flare and crackle and roar. This is the yearly recurrent overture of negro and Maya husbandry, "fire-stick cultivation," as in the West Indies we nowadays contemptuously call it. The trees are felled and consumed, or where they resist are lopped of their branches, the trunks left standing sometimes like blackened obelisks. Roots are levered out and the soil turned up with sharpened stakes or hoes, the litter chopped and fired again till the ground is clear for planting. The soil is rich with the decayed leaf-mould of many seasons. The burning releases potash and destroys insect life and weeds in the surface soil. Food plants are sown and set.

The East African Commission of 1924 referred contemptuously to the "higgledy-piggledy" aspect of native cultivation in Kenya and Kavirondo. Of course it looks higgledy-piggledy. Cobbett, with his veneration of Jethro Tull, the father of drill husbandry, would have branded it with some unforgettable epithet. But it is planted for a rotation. The knowledgeable cultivator carefully studies the ground and sets each particular plant or seed where he or she thinks the soil will suit it best and where the growth

will blend most conveniently with the general purpose. The selections and combinations are very varied. Of the vegetables, food plants, and fruit trees grown in Africa and the West Indies, and indeed all round the world in this method, some are native to the country, everywhere many of the commonest are exotic. There has been an impressive diffusion of popular food plants between Asia, Africa, America, and Polynesia. Yams of various kinds, sweet potatoes, gourds, kidney beans and other legumes, spinaches, salads, maize, millet, cassava, ground nuts, plantains, bananas, ochroes and other mallows, peppers, onions, sugar-cane, akees, and then the berry and fruit trees, coffee, oranges, limes, bread fruit, pears—in profuse variety have been distributed and adapted for this cultivation according to the character of the soils and climate. Traditional arts of growing them have been developed, whether the particular operations are discharged by the women or by the men, or divided between them.

Of this African agriculture Mr H. L. Shantz, of the Bureau of Plant Industry of the United States Department of Agriculture, contributing to the Report of the Phelps-Stokes Commission on African Education, writes as follows:—

> "The agricultural methods of the natives in Africa have often been condemned as shiftless, wasteful, and destined to decrease the productivity of the country. Again one meets continually the statement that the native knows nothing about crop production. These statements, in a way, reflect the attitude of the European towards the native, the assumption being that, since he does not follow our methods and our practices, he must be essentially wrong. But there are many testimonies in the literature to the effect that the native is an excellent agriculturalist. It is well to bear in mind that very little serious attention has been given to his methods and practices, and that there is no adequate scientific study of native agriculture on which to base sound conclusions.
>
> "It must be admitted that he produces the necessary food by his method: that the famines are

the result of unfavourable seasons and lack of foresight, in storage of food to carry over the famine period. That may not be poor culture. It may be poor planning. But it is only our elaborate system for the distribution of foods that protects civilised man from the recurrence of famine; and even now there is seldom a time where in some part of our world there is not a shortage of food.

"The practice of abandoning land after a few crops and cultivating a new patch is generally condemned. It is said to leave the land depleted of plant food and subject to rapid erosion: but this might easily have happened had the land been kept under cultivation. Natives by their methods of abandoning their land and taking a new piece accomplish what the European, with all his staff of scientifically trained men, has not yet satisfactorily accomplished. They escape the problems of soil fertility and physical condition, and the question to a very great extent of plant diseases. Natives do not cultivate the poor land. They choose the best. At this they are wonderfully well skilled, and the Europeans should make careful study of their methods. In this they are greatly aided by their method of cultivation. If they used ploughs it would not always be easy to choose the best land."

All the foregoing and more that Dr Shantz writes to the same effect applies word for word to the agriculture of the transplanted African.

What the West Indian negro calls "bread-kind" (tubers producing starch foods) have to stand in some cases two years before they mature. Cassava stands three or longer. In between and round about the hills or ridges made for the tubers the quicker growing plants are put in and harvested successively as they mature. Plantains and bananas may be set around the plot or here and there about it, so as not to shade the earlier crops too much. If the cultivator intends permanent occupation he will also plant coffee, kola, annatto, or other shrubs to bring in food or money, when the vegetables have been reaped. But African agriculture of this type does not contemplate permanent

occupation. Animal manure is not used, except by some more advanced African tribes.

This art of food cultivation is, for its purposes, highly efficient. On a well-chosen and well-handled plot the quantity of food produced is astonishing and the yield is continuous. In Jamaica especially, where the method has been intelligently developed and improved, good peasant cultivation of this mixed character yields annual values running frequently up to £40 an acre (the pre-War wage of an Oxfordshire labourer). But the method exhausts the land and the plot has to be shifted. A nomad habit is maintained in the population. Spent land must be abandoned to rest, as our own ancestors fallowed theirs before rotation husbandry was invented. But fallows in tropical countries cannot be pastured by cattle, because the acres are not continuous, and an open-field system cannot be practised, whilst weeds and coarse vegetation spring up more quickly than any sort of grass that will feed stock. When the yield no longer repays the labour the plot is allowed to grow up in bush. After a period of years the new jungle is again cut down and fired; the seeds of the weeds in the soil burnt up and the insect life destroyed. Cultivation is reinstated and proceeds as before. What the African husbandman likes best is virgin woodland. The accumulated fertility repays the heavy labour of clearing. The forest is ruined, to the grief of the lover of timber. After the land has been cleared once or more, it frequently happens that, by the time the cultivators have done with it, exposure to weather has caused a good deal of the soil to be washed away. This is one of the wasteful effects. The destruction of the forest diminishes the capacity of the soil to retain moisture and feed the springs; after repeated clearances the tropical rains wash out and carry away the humus, the soil becomes more and more barren, where it is shallow it is washed off bodily from the rock, or the hard, raw subsoil is left exposed. Such "ruinate" land is a frequent eye-sore both in Africa and wherever the negro has practised this traditional husbandry. It is, in fact, a rational and efficient art of agriculture, but only so long as there is abundance of land to be used. To Europeans, who have so long had no land to waste, who

have long ceased their migrations and have had to devise a system of static husbandry and renew their soil by manuring, native African agriculture is exasperating.

This traditional agriculture was imported into the West Indies by negro slaves, and, so far as negroes either free or by sufferance had access there to land for their own purposes, this was the system they there pursued.

Agriculture is the paramount industry of our tropical and sub-tropical colonies. Englishmen are now attempting in Africa what they undertook in the seventeenth century in the West Indies, namely, as planters and farmers, to establish communities maintaining a European civilisation upon a basis of negro labour. In the West Indies the labour was that of kidnapped slaves. We now repudiate slavery and, theoretically and professedly at any rate, forced or constrained labour. Can a stably prosperous agricultural State be built up by white men in a community where the labouring population are free native Africans? The history of Jamaica yields instructive material for guidance. Jamaica (population 920,000) is the largest agricultural community in the British West Indies. Its civilisation is European, though of its inhabitants not one in sixty is white. Recent developments in West Africa are also, no doubt, significant. The prosperity of West African agriculture has advanced enormously through the practically unaided development of the cultivation of cocoa by natives. And social improvements accompany the economic. But pioneers of white colonisation in East and South-East Africa disclaim that West African developments can have any relevance to East African problems, which are those of what is spoken of as a "white man's country," although the people to whom it looks for its manual labour are black. It might correspondingly be propounded that the economic and social history of Jamaica has also been so different from anything African that no lessons can be learnt from the one part of the world by the other. I propose to attempt to indicate that in important essentials this is not the case, but that the conditions are impressively parallel.

European agriculture is a highly developed art, greatly superior in its total efficiency to that of African negroid communities. It is superior in its primary dealing with the soil,

in regard to access, fencing, drainage and tillage, for which it is far better equipped with tools and machinery. It has evolved the art of manuring, both by combining cattle-keeping with tillage and by the application of chemistry. To its earlier machinery for ploughing, cleaning, drilling, harvesting, threshing, it has more recently added mechanical traction and transport. Most European tropical planting has involved the conjunction with husbandry of manufacturing processes, again requiring machinery and the developed techniques of Europe. Formerly every sugar estate was also a factory, progressively demanding improved engineering and chemistry. The same was true of coffee, tea, tobacco, fibres, and other staples, the marketable value of which depends upon factory processes, in almost all cases best carried on in large establishments, the capitalisation of which is impossible for peasant or native cultivators. There is now, indeed, a rapidly growing tendency to divorce manufacture from cultivation. The planters' work tends to specialise on pure farming, the manufacturing to be transferred to central factories, either independently capitalised or co-operatively owned and managed on behalf of the planters. An elaborate productive system of this character, which greatly increases the yield of agricultural values in proportion to the physical labour directly employed in the field, can only be introduced and established by representatives of the civilisation which has evolved modern methods of industry. Yet the actual work on the soil which grows the community's food and the raw materials destined for manufacture must, it is recognised, remain non-European. Can the labour of native Africans be made stably efficient in their share of this exotic and complex method of wealth production? Englishmen are familiar with, and naturally have confidence in, our English system of capitalist farmers hiring and directing wage-labourers. They inevitably start by assuming that an efficient agriculture must needs be so conducted, and that the establishment of such a system is the best thing European civilisation can offer the African, who will find it to his advantage to earn his living by regular work at wages. But that system has its roots in an agricultural, economic, and social history which is peculiar to our own island. It does not pre-

dominate even so short a distance away as the other side of either channel that bounds our shores. It has no kind of root, preparation or parallel in uncivilised Africa, where no industrial revolution has created a landless working-class; and it might appear at best somewhat sanguine to take it for granted that as a system of agriculture it is likely to prove the best in such a country, or even workable there.

Jamaica in slavery-time had a well-developed system of arable and pastoral agriculture, carried on with an intelligence quite up to the standard of their times by English planters. In their generation they were as wise and as enterprising as new British settlers in Africa are in our own. Their sugar estates lay in the plains around the shores of the island, or where suitable lands could be found in the valleys and uplands. They built and furnished fine homes and factories of good masonry suitable for their time, though too small for modern economy. For water and water-power they tunnelled hills and built long, arcaded stone or brick aqueducts, like the Romans.

The coffee estates were among the mountains, very largely on the white limestone formation which covers three-fifths of the island. These planters also were able and spirited. Beckford's house at Fonthill in Jamaica has ruins as ambitious, proportionally, as those of his Wiltshire Folly.

Large areas of the island remained in forest. These lands were private property, but only used by their owners for timber and fuel supply for the sugar works. Most estates had their "mountain" employed for this purpose. In these "mountains" worn-out slaves, or freed negroes renting plots, were allowed to grow provisions. They practised their traditional African agriculture in methods indistinguishable from those used in West Africa to this day. This agriculture was not so highly specialised as is that of some agricultural tribes in East and Central Africa. The West African and his West Indian descendant were not corn growers or field agriculturalists. Nor had they cattle; and though Jamaica is so excellent a cattle country, cattle, whether for milk or manure, remained entirely unused by the negro squatters. Fortunately, most of the upland country has a porous chalky subsoil which retains

moisture, and when land has been cleared for fuel or negro grounds, secondary forest and bush quickly reclothed it, which was not the case on the deeper and heavier soils.

Jamaica was settled with the intention that it should be a "white man's country." All the desirable land was granted out by the Crown in large "patents" of 2000 acres or more to English settlers. Laborious Dutchmen were imported from Surinam to start sugar-planting, as Africander farmers were introduced into Kenya. The lands were patented on a nominal quit rent of ½d. an acre. The unalienated lands, not of large extent, were remote and inaccessible. There was practically no land left for negroes to own, nor was there in early days any demand for it, for most of the negroes were slaves.

After emancipation the sugar and coffee estates declined. In the uplands many went out of hand entirely or were carried on with the least possible labour, as cattle, pimento, and logwood "pens." The negro quarters on the old sugar estates were miserable hovels. Their sites are marked to-day by the fruit trees that were planted about them; but the negro's favourite foodstuffs, yams and other "bread kind," could not be grown there. They needed woodland soil and the African mode of culture. Some upland estates were bought by missionaries, chiefly Moravian. They established villages of negro small-holders whom they helped in their agriculture and taught and encouraged to add to it, to grow coffee and other saleable crops and boil sugar for island markets. Their congregations built their own churches and school-houses. It was missionary effort of this kind that alone laid the foundations of improved negro peasant production and civilised life. On the estates which survived, the freed negroes remained very poor, very ill-paid, very squalid and in no way progressive, at any rate so far as any influences of the estate system affected them. Partly, no doubt, owing to the traditions of slavery, estate work remained unimproving to them. Contact with it exercised no civilising or educational influence. The labourers were as lazy as they could be. No proprietor that could keep his estate going would sell land to negroes. The difficulty of obtaining plantation labour increased. In some of the smaller West Indian islands, where there was much

unoccupied land, estates became more and more unworkable. The cultivation of sugar estates in Demerara, Trinidad, and St Lucia and parts of Jamaica was only maintained by importing indentured Indian labour. Some districts of Jamaica through special conditions managed to carry on without this, but the negroes there were poorest.

The Royal Commissioners who visited Jamaica in 1883 print a statement by the Rev. Josiah Cork, an Anglican clergyman, whose curacy began about the time of the abolition of slavery and who was one of those who endeavoured, by the provision of land and advice, to improve the conditions of the ex-slaves and free cultivators. He recalls that immediately after emancipation high rents were almost universally imposed by estate proprietors on the huts and provision grounds of the negroes upon their properties, and the wages of hired labour were reduced by one-half. The result was a hasty stampede from the estates of multitudes of labourers to purchase small freeholds, for which, when they were to be had, high prices were asked. On freeholds thus acquired, generally outlying (for the stronger estates would not sell) and with well-timbered lands, clearings were made for African agriculture, remote from the white men's estates.

It was to these outlying lands that food-growing was almost wholly transferred, for during the apprenticeship period which followed slavery the labourers had been for the most part confined to the land they had cultivated on the estates' mountains, and had wellnigh exhausted it by 1838, when apprenticeship ceased. Only those, however, who had some command of means could acquire freeholds; the less provident, renting squatters or merely trespassers, had still to labour for hire and could only partially raise their food, or left food-growing to their families, while they worked for wages to earn money to buy land. Taxation was made heavy upon the small freeholders; the smaller the freehold, the higher the rate of the tax. The natural result was a growing discontent, which only the great fertility of the newly occupied lands for a while partly stifled. (It will be observed that these conditions were essentially similar to those now regarded as necessary for the development of "white men's countries" in Africa,

namely, restriction and segregation of negro landowning, the levying of high rents and high hut-taxes, and pressure on the men to work on estates, leaving the burden of food-growing on the family. The apprenticeship system, which failed, had been designed philanthropically both to maintain the estates' cultivation and the civilisation of the negroes by "contact.") The resulting discontent rendered necessary some reform of the fiscal system, and the burden of taxation was in some measure transferred from direct to indirect duties, of customs and excise, which, so far as food was concerned, did not press heavily on the negroes, who grew most of their own. And this, Mr Cork remarks, must have happened years earlier had not the quantity of outlying woodlands been so great, for which a high rent was gladly paid for fresh food-growing lands, unaccompanied by the obnoxious direct property-tax. As these lands became in many parts fully occupied, the natural result of wasteful culture ensued, the profit gradually came down to and fell below the rent. The fertility of the available lands being exhausted, the negro cultivators, left without guidance towards the improvement of their cultivation, so as to make continuous cropping possible, looked desperately towards the large reserved estates of the white landowners, and their increasing distress conduced largely to the Jamaica "Rebellion" of 1865.

This process is now repeating itself in South Africa in those parts in which white land monopoly has been established, and the improvement of native agriculture neglected. It will inevitably repeat itself in Nyasaland and Kenya, unless the policy of developing native agriculture and encouraging the production of crops that will feed the natives and yield them money too is resolutely pursued. The essential superiority of estate cultivation and the European system of farming over the native African system of food-growing is that they are continuous, and put back into the soil year by year what they take out. Hence, unquestionably, in the West Indies, quite independently of considerations of "labour policy," the sugar industry with its efficient productivity was of indispensable value, and so long as negro cultivation was left to take care of itself, the argument that the estates must be maintained, even at the

cost of putting pressure upon the negroes to work on them, had some ostensible cogency. Moreover, it was addressed to saving an established economy on which the State had depended for generations and with which institutions of public importance were still bound up, and not to the introduction of a new and exotic system of exploitation of coloured labour by immigrants.

> "The Commissioners," Mr Cork wrote, "have only to examine for themselves to ascertain the fact that native food is far from being in abundance in the markets; the growers generally travel far from their homes to grow it and carry it far to sell it, the country the while being wholly deforested to meet the demand for food growth. This growth ought to suffice to make imported food in flour and other vegetables, and drinkables too, luxuries only, and to be bought as such by sale of the cultivator's surplus."

Forty to fifty years ago, then, the position in Jamaica was this. With a numerous and prolific population the larger sugar estates were being worked with imported labour; many properties were being maintained with a minimum of labour as "pens." Most of the island still was owned in large private estates thus handled, or in some cases rented to negroes cultivating in African fashion. In some districts where soil and climate were suitable and missionaries and education had done their work, there were many fairly prosperous and civilised "small settlers," intelligent black people of valuable character, growing coffee and other saleable produce, keeping ponies, mules, asses, and some small stock, but in other respects pursuing a system of agriculture still primitive and inefficient. In the fertile north-east of the island a less civilised population, under the stimulus of American shippers, was beginning to develop a very profitable export trade in bananas. There was a good deal of broken country from which the owners had disappeared and on which there were squatters living in wretched hovels and cultivating unprofitably and wastefully. The industry of the renters on estates which let land was of similar character. The cultivation of labourers resident on estates was superficial and worthless. There were some remote

Crown lands still in thick forest, similarly squatted and trespassed upon. The Government was constantly being solicited to sell new lands to negroes outside the already partially settled districts. They were not unreasonably reluctant to do this, for "fire-stick" cultivation had already destroyed much of the country, and operated to draw population further and further away from the centres of civilisation. Meanwhile the native food supply remained continually in danger of falling short.

After the "Jamaica Rebellion" Crown Government replaced the elected Assembly which had represented the white landowning and planting oligarchy. The new legislature consisted at first entirely of officials and Government nominees. Nine elected members were introduced in 1883, the majority remaining official and nominated. In 1895 the elected membership was increased to fourteen, one for each parish. The elected members had the power to decide any question unless the Government declared its decision adversely to their vote to be of paramount public importance. The electoral qualification, for either men or women, is now occupancy as owner or tenant of house or land paying in local or island taxes not less than 10s. a year. The constitution has thus been progressively rendered almost completely democratic and the majority of the electors are peasant proprietors. The present Lord Irwin and Mr Ormsby-Gore, who visited Jamaica in 1923, reported that this constitution has worked very healthily for the island, and recommended its still further liberalisation.

I recall this political history because it has done a good deal to influence the wholesome development of land policy and agricultural policy in the island during the last thirty years. Sir John Peter Grant, the first Crown Colony Governor, set up a "Survey of Lands" Department. All lands of which the ownership and title were not at that time apparent were progressively classified, their histories and titles inquired into and surveys made, and in cases where the lands were unclaimed or in illegal adverse possession, possession taken on behalf of the Crown. Many properties all over the island were in the occupancy of squatters, and on very extensive tracts the Crown quit rents had not been paid for years. Under successive laws the Govern-

ment was made Trustee of all lands in the occupation of persons having no ostensible title.

If legal owners appeared they could recover the lands upon payment of the expenses incurred by the Government, and arrears of quit rent, but after seven years' notice the Government had the power to sell. Many thousands of acres were thus recovered from squatters. Much land has been restored to its legal owners, much has been sold after the expiry of the seven years' trusteeship, the remainder is still in the hands of the Government, some of it rented to tenants or exploited by the Crown Lands Department by licences for timber and firewood.

Under the laws enabling the forfeit of lands for non-payment of quit rents the titles to more than a million acres have been investigated, the areas and boundaries ascertained, and the lands advertised as forfeitable. Of this about 275,000 acres have been actually resumed by the Crown; the quit rents on much of the rest have been paid, and much remain in process of forfeiture.

By this process of resumption of title to lands originally granted out in large estates with a view to "development," but left in neglect and withheld from legitimate use by the negroes, the Government was put in a position to deal with the land of the island in the interests of the whole community. The Governor who did most in this direction was the late Sir Henry Blake.

Blake was an Irishman, and while fully appreciative of the essential importance and value of an able class of estate owners, whose interest as planters and stock-breeders he actively studied and served, and with whom he was deservedly popular, he was also, no doubt through the environment of his nurture, appreciative of the psychology and possibilities of a quick-witted and insubordinate peasantry as distinguished from those of a population of disciplined and depressed Anglo-Saxon agricultural labourers, and knew that landlordism and wage-employment are not the conclusive word for an agricultural community of free-spirited people. He and his wife loved Jamaica and her inhabitants of all classes. They had the primary qualification for their position, of being entirely devoid of colour prejudice. I have, in fact, heard Blake spoken of by a critic of his land

policy as a "pronounced negrophilist"—an imputation so damaging and so hostile that it was whispered with bated breath. It was evidently regarded as the last word of disproof of his statesmanship, whereas, in the sense in which it was very happily true, it was the source of some of his best inspired policy. Contrary to the then still prevalent theory that the prosperity of Jamaica was dependent on the economy of the large estates and the maintenance of their labour-supply, and the concurrent doctrine (which I have quoted elsewhere in the words of its leading champion to-day in Kenya), that if every negro was to be owner of sufficient land on which to maintain himself the question of obtaining a sufficient labour-supply would never be settled, Blake did two notable things for the island. He instituted a policy for the deliberate and orderly settlement of negro proprietors on the lands which the Government had been put in a position to deal with as I have described, though it had not so far encouraged their use in that manner. And to help negroes to establish and maintain themselves on such lands he founded the Jamaica Agricultural Society.

In 1895 Blake's scheme for the sale of lands to small settlers was brought into operation. Not less than five acres nor more than fifty could be sold to any one person. The usual price was £2 an acre. A deposit of one-fifth had to be made, after which the land was surveyed and the applicant placed in possession: the remaining four-fifths, together with £2 for the survey, being payable by ten equal yearly instalments. If within ten years the purchaser has brought one-fifth of his acreage into good bearing in permanent planting he is refunded or released from the payment of one-fifth of the purchase money. The response to the scheme was immediate and continuous; and thousands of peasant freeholds have been established under it. The making of good access by roads was provided for at the same period.

The philosophy of improving agriculture through Government aid in tropical colonies has been progressive. In Jamaica it began, as it has done elsewhere, with the establishment of a Government Botanic Department, the principal purpose of which was to introduce, test, and

naturalise exotic economic plants. It was only after the recommendations of the West Indian Royal Commission of 1897 that these institutions began to be broadened into Government Departments of Agriculture. That Commission's report resulted in the establishment of the Imperial West Indian Department of Agriculture, and the latest important offspring of the same stimulus is the Imperial College of Tropical Agriculture in Trinidad. The Department of Public Gardens and Plantations in Jamaica, founded by Sir J. P. Grant, had attempted the cultivation of cinchona and tea, and under Sir Henry Blake established groves of oranges and grape-fruit experimentally in the Blue Mountains. These undertakings did not survive, but the Department had liberally and usefully distributed seeds and seedlings of economic plants and trees. Its operations were still essentially based on the aim of helping white planters with estate cultivation. The Jamaica Agricultural Department which grew out of it progressively enlarged its scope and activities, establishing a scientific staff, including chemists, entomologists, and microbiologists, to which there have been latterly added inspectors of plant diseases. This Government Department also maintains successfully two stock farms and an agricultural school. The Jamaica Government first began to pay some attention to negro production by appointing a travelling instructor attached to the Public Gardens. And the purpose was not the improvement of the negro agriculture, but the encouragement of production for export—a purpose, of course, in itself very desirable, but distinct. His visits, which were intended to give advice in the pruning and curing of cocoa, coffee, and other exportable produce, were regarded by the peasantry with suspicion. They judged that they were really made for the purpose of spying out any prosperity they might attain to, with a view to increasing their taxes. The prodigious increase of banana growing, which was built up on peasant production, being an African crop, then completely despised by the planters, but which had, in fact, been the means of saving the island from such disastrous depression as resulted elsewhere from the collapse of the sugar industry, had greatly increased their prosperity, and peasant property and small settler's agri-

culture were looking up and becoming recognised as of public value. But there was a tax on cultivated land as distinct from waste land, and, trivial as its incidence was, it maintained a preference for a method of husbandry that could not be identified as cultivation. The problem of improving negro agriculture was never really tackled until the Jamaica Agricultural Society, ostensibly detached from the Government, was established.

The Society was founded, almost simultaneously with the Crown Lands Settlement Scheme, in 1895. The Legislature granted £1000 towards its expenses of organisation. Special Committees were appointed to investigate the position of each agricultural industry, what could be done to improve the quality of agricultural produce, whether its variety could be increased and new industries developed, the markets available, and whether better means of handling and shipping products could be suggested. Full reports were made on these subjects. The establishment of a Government Stock Farm was recommended. It opened its public work on much the same lines as those followed by the great Agricultural Societies in this country, holding large and expensively organised shows either for the whole of the island or for the principal convenient divisions; and the favoured exhibits were cattle and horse-kind and representative products of the large estate cultivation. But the purposes of the Society and the aims of those who most devotedly worked for it were much farther-reaching. They were addressed to transforming the African agriculture of the peasantry into an intelligent and scientific system of profitable production. For this purpose it was vital to get into touch with the "small settlers," the backbone of the negro population, who were actually at the time (owing to the development of the banana trade) producing the bulk of the exports. It was essential to get these people to understand the Society's aims, to show them what it was doing, what it proposed to do, and what it could do with the co-operation of the community, and generally to try and arouse an earnest interest in and enthusiasm for improved agriculture. But these men deeply suspected the Government, associating it (as African natives have even more reason to do to-day) principally

with the imposition and collection of taxes. This gulf had to be bridged. The Board of Management being mainly elected to represent all agricultural classes, and free to criticise the Government, to press agricultural needs and reforms upon its attention, to inquire sympathetically into the grievances and needs of small settlers and to make due representations if these were found reasonable, was an institution well constituted to mitigate this suspicious aloofness. This missionary enterprise involved prolonged and energetic effort on the part of the leaders of the Society, its successive secretaries and their staff. Their work encountered obstinate conservatism, indifference, easy-going insouciance and self-confident ignorance in both the principal agricultural classes, and at best a good-humoured tolerance, grumbles that the Society was a waste of public money, and a confident belief that the effort would soon collapse.

In 1897, however, after the visit of the West India Royal Commission, the Legislature was induced to increase its grant to £4000, and the Society began to publish a monthly journal, which has appeared ever since without intermission; except when the printing office collapsed in the earthquake of 1907.

The establishment of local branch societies had been intended, but did not at first make much progress. One travelling instructor was employed, detached from the Department of Public Gardens and Plantations, and an instructor in bee-keeping. The Society took steps to promote and extend the manufacture of Jippa-Jappa (Jamaica Panama) hats, a strictly local industry, by distributing the fibre plant in suitable districts and by holding classes.

The branch societies slowly grew; they began to invite the presence of the travelling instructor at their meetings and for visits to members' holdings. Two, and then three, part-time instructors were added. More and more instructors, to be assigned to particular districts, had to be found and worked on full time. The secretary of the Society, who visited each district regularly, was the link between the instructors and the Managing Board.

The journal became popular, articles in it were read and discussed at meetings. Reports at branch meetings

began to appear in the newspapers. Correspondence with the Central Office increased steadily.

	Direct Members.	Branches.	Branch Members.	Agricultural Instructors.
In 1897 there were .	364	6 with	300	1
„ 1910 „ „ .	500	63 „	3300	11
„ 1923 „ „ .	571	267 „	7621	16

The work of the instructors is the Society's most influential function. They attend all meetings of branches, report to the office the attendance and the subjects discussed, give addresses on technical topics of current importance, and generally deal with local agricultural matters. They take interest in the work of Agricultural Loan Banks, and help to establish them. They are not allowed to act on Bank Committees, but give advice and help where these have not able local assistance already. Nearly all the local Loan Banks have been established through the branch societies, but are run as distinct bodies. The work of the instructors is governed by the Society's Instructors' Committee, which meets every month. Each instructor submits a proposed itinerary of his work for each day in full detail of time and place, so that the travelling Supervisor of Instructors may be able to appear there without special notice, and go through the work of the day or the week with him. Each month the instructors send in a detailed report of their work, and a general report on the cultural interests of their district and the state of the crops. These reports are submitted to the Instructors' Committee with analyses and remarks by the secretary.

The instructors in the course of their work give constant demonstrations on the people's own grounds on pruning and spraying, advice on the suppression of insect pests and treatment of plant diseases, and on suitable methods of cultivation generally. They carry out many local experiments for the improvement of holdings in connection with local prize competitions. They are constantly on the watch to detect diseases and insect pests. Any symptoms of the most important diseases are immediately reported to the secretary and to the Director of Agriculture, whose inspectors are despatched to attend to them.

During the earlier years of this work the general public did not see very striking results—they had to be looked for on the peasants' own lands—but a great development was quietly going on. The value of the organisation and work was extremely appreciable after the hurricane of 1903, and again during the great drought of 1907, and even more after the hurricane of 1912, when seeds and plants were quickly and systematically distributed through the branch societies and admirable restorative work done by the agricultural instructors by holding-to-holding visits. The scope of the Society and the number of its branches were on each of these occasions quickly extended. The hurricane of 1912 gave an impetus to the formation of Loan Banks. After that of 1903 the Government had begun to make direct loans to the peasantry to reinstate their permanent crops. The demand for the formation of branches and for the appointment of instructors outran the funds available. Branch societies increasingly sent representatives to the General Meeting; until it was decided that the business required two half-yearly General Meetings; and recently there has been a demand for a two-days' meeting half-yearly.

The instructors are very carefully chosen after tests of their qualifications both in the field and by written examination, and receive some business training in the Society's office. There is plenty of competition for these posts, largely among the class of men who would make successful schoolmasters, loving agriculture and good friends with their people. Considerable versatility, knowledge, and tact are required. They have shown themselves a very public-spirited body of men, and on special emergencies caused by hurricanes or outbreaks of plant disease have worked most valuably.

The branch societies are debarred from political discussion or action, but proposals affecting the public administration of agricultural interests are discussed and debated locally, examined and criticised at the Board, and approved representations made to the Government or the Director of Agriculture.

Experience has shown that one of the most effectual means for increasing effort and production among the small

cultivators is competition for prizes for holdings. Competitions are held in rotation in groups of four parishes in yearly succession, and timely preparations for them are made with the help and advice of local instructors. Marks are given on a classified scheme of purposes to be aimed at: the house, the garden, fencing, stock, poultry, provision-ground cultivation, drainage and water storage, coffee and other permanent cash-yielding crops, manuring, mulching, tillage, the pruning and care of fruit trees. These competitions have proved so popular and so convincing in results that in addition to the regular scheme, small local food-growing competitions, principally for yams, corn, and cassava, have been organised by branches subscribing their own prize money, with occasional help from neighbouring proprietors. During the War the Society's organisation enabled great special efforts in food-growing drives to be organised. In the yam-growing competitions it is required that plantains, bananas, coffee, and orange trees be planted through the yams, thus securing the establishment of permanent crops. These competitions are always carried out on old lands, some of them previously almost derelict, and the effects of cultivation, manure, and bush mulching in securing good crops from such lands, and through periods of protracted drought, have been remarkable. The established example spreads to the non-competitors.

Agricultural Shows, always popular and attractive, are now organised by the branches themselves. The Society supplies tents on hire, receptacles for exhibits, and instructors to judge and help in arrangements. The secretary attends all Shows. In addition to live stock and riding and driving competitions, all manner of agricultural produce is entered, local handicraft of all sorts, women's home industries, hat-weaving, laundry and needlework.

The Society and the island owe much to public-spirited men of all classes who have continuously taken leading parts in its work, and especially to the peculiar qualifications and unflagging energy and enthusiasm of its two successive secretaries. The democratic character of its organisation and the contact which it has established between the planting and pen-keeping class whose members act on the Board and in many branches, and the peasant agriculture

for the improvement of which they have heartily worked, have been most valuable to the social atmosphere of the island. In regard to control of plant diseases and the maintenance of the quality of the island's staples, the interests of the two classes are plainly identical. Moreover, in Jamaica, more and more, there is ceasing to be the former line of distinction between the two main classes of cultivators, for out of the small settlers' agriculture there has arisen a gradation of planting enterprises of all dimensions between the normal £40-holding of the small settler and the 2000-acre estate of the planter or pen-keeper.

There are now in Jamaica 151,000 taxed holdings of land exceeding $\frac{1}{4}$ acre. Of these about 115,000 are of £40 value or less, 22,000 between £40 and £100, 13,000 more not exceeding £1000, and 1400 exceeding £1000.

The report of the Supervisor of Instructors on holdings entered for competition in the parish of Manchester for 1927-28 bears witness to the results attained in the development of the art of negro agriculture without shifting of ground:

> "This is the seventh Prize Holdings Competition held in this parish since the inauguration of this very valuable work by the Jamaica Agricultural Society—and while some of the former competitions have been carried through under difficulties, there has never been anything to compare with the present instance. Heavy and continuous rains prevailed throughout September and October, then suddenly ceased; from November 1927 to July 1928 hot sun and hot dry winds persisted day after day, until the earth became parched and the usual agricultural operations became impossible, and the water supply for both man and beast was practically exhausted, making it necessary to spend much valuable time in going from district to district in search of water. However, in spite of these great difficulties the competitors persisted in their efforts to protect their crops and stock against the effects of the drought, and to get the holdings ready for the competition.
>
> "While, of course, the holdings could not fail to show the ill-effects of the long drought, they certainly

showed still more prominently the good effects of care and cultivation. To see the way in which some of the competitors have brought their crops through a drought of nearly ten months' duration was gratifying beyond measure. As I have already mentioned, the task of judging these holdings was not made more pleasant by the hot, dry winds and scorching sun, but at the same time they did but render the contrast afforded by the beautifully cultivated citrus and coffee groves more refreshing. While the majority of people in the parish were getting desperately short of water it was most pleasing to see some competitors who could point with pride to stores of beautifully clear fresh water, and there is no doubt that the peasantry generally are making great improvements in the provision of this first essential of life, thanks to the help available from the parochial funds at the instigation of the Jamaica Agricultural Society. Great improvements are also observable in the housing and general surroundings of the competitors. Thirty-eight were awarded full marks for the condition of their house, and the sanitary conditions also show a very marked improvement and it is only fair to mention here that the Jamaica Agricultural Society was the first body to methodically urge improvement on these lines. The general condition of the stock throughout the whole competition showed most marked improvement; I do not think I saw one tick.

"Manchester, together with some of the other parishes and sections of parishes, was noted even from the early days of the competition for the very neat and tidy holdings, and in some instances the well-kept staple crops, particularly coffee, pimento, and citrus. But beyond a certain point there was a kind of stagnation, a want of life, energy, and interest, and the lack of a desire for further development; and particularly any decided or systematic effort to combat the effect of drought and other climatic difficulties. After following with keen interest the influence of these competitions, and the detailed work of the instructors over a long number of years, and comparing the con-

ditions that exist to-day with the past, say, fifteen or twenty years ago, one is greatly impressed with the changes which have been brought about. The holdings of the present day which have come under the above influence are full of life and interest, and are alert to receive advice and suggestions for development of all kinds. The keeping of stock on the holdings has vastly increased, and the use that is now made of these for maintaining the fertility of the soil has made great changes. The introduction of heavy 'bush' mulching has made possible the growing of splendid crops of yams and other foodstuffs, as well as excellent bananas for export on land which in the past would have been considered impossible. The introduction of improved methods of cultivation, the knowledge of how to treat pests and diseases, and how to fight the evil effects of a drought, etc., have created a new interest and given a wider outlook on life, and it is impossible at the present time to go into an up-to-date holding without feeling the change. The manner in which so many of the holdings have come through the recent prolonged and severe drought should be an eloquent testimony to the value of these changes."

There is much parallelism between the Jamaica conditions and policy in regard to land and labour which I have reviewed, and those now in play in Africa, where emigrants are setting up a community dependent chiefly on agriculture, with a white employing class and negro labourers. In both it has been regarded as axiomatic that the organised cultural art and practice of Europeans are necessary for the maintenance of the essentials of white civilisation. In both there is a populace of African cultivators dependent for their food supply upon an incomplete agriculture carried on in an unstable and in some respects wasteful fashion. Although the condition of the peasantry of Jamaica has been much modified and improved, the progress has been from a condition of things which two generations ago appeared to many people quite as unpromising, notwithstanding previous centuries of white civilisation, as they may appear in Kenya to-day. For purposes of com-

parison I speak of Kenya especially, because the ambition of European settlement there is to make it a community of a character as different from West Africa as are the British West Indies. Elsewhere in Africa there is being attempted a policy of building up a civilisation based on the native life. There was never any notion of that in the West Indies and it is not the policy in Kenya to-day: at any rate, so far as concerns that portion of the extensive area so-called which forms the highland enclave deemed suitable for permanent white habitation. Jamaica, it might appear, had advantages which made negro progress there easier. It had: but the significant thing is that they had accomplished so little. The institutions of State were English in character: the language was English: Christianity was diffused: elementary school education, though long withheld, and still very deficient, was widely available. The estates had for generations been worked on a system of agriculture founded on European practice, well adapted to local conditions. Negroes had been trained for generations upon these estates. The black population was plentiful. The maintenance of estate cultivation was regarded as the first necessity of the State. The acquisition and occupation of land by negroes had been discouraged and restricted as much as possible, not only on the plea of economic advantage but on the argument that work on estates and contact with the employing class was an educative influence and that the negroes became barbarised (which was true) if they got away into the backwoods far from markets, churches, and schools. The fiscal system had been trimmed to subserve this policy; never, indeed, with such frank directness as it is in our new African colonies, because British sentiment with regard to dealings with negroes still at that period remained liberal, and paid respect to the principles which had decreed the abolition of slavery. Nevertheless, as now in Africa, the taxes on the negroes' huts were excessive, the taxes on their holdings were burdensome, out of all proportion to those on larger properties. Heavy import duties were levied upon such kinds of merchandise as they were likely to wish to buy, in order to encourage them to work for more money to buy them. Notwithstanding this pressure and the abundance of population, the planters

suffered from lack of labour supply and clamoured for Indian immigrants, while outside the estates there persisted and slowly extended the African system of agriculture. Some proprietors abandoned their cultivation and rented land to squatters. Others allowed grounds rent-free to tenants who would give them labour at wages. The complaint was not so much that the labour was inefficient as that it was intermittent and unreliable. Except in such an island as Barbados, where there is complete white land monopoly, this must generally be the case in a mixed community: for the normal man, whether black or white, prefers to be his own master and to use his own time and industry as it suits him best. The estates' wages were very low—9d. and 1s. a day—and if the negro had had to depend upon them for buying his food, he must have starved. The food supply for the most part necessarily depended upon the peasant agriculture. The negro householder had perforce to devote part of his time to his food cultivation. Growing crops for sale as well, he had to attend to these in their season and to harvest and market them. His bananas he had to cut and carry down to the wharf on the same days as his banana-growing employer. The existence of a negro system of agriculture must needs cause uncertainty of labour supply to a concurrent European estate system. This is recognised in Kenya to-day, and sufficient taxation has been imposed on the natives there to induce them to make labour contracts of periods from one to six months. This no Jamaica negro would ever do, regarding it as a renewal of slavery. These contracts can only be enforced in Africa by rigorous masters' and servants' laws, for the application of which, by the aid of the police, a system of registration and thumb-print identification of labourers has been imposed on the natives of Kenya, greatly to their satisfaction. The feeling of the negro about such contracts, whether in the West Indies or in East Africa, is simple and logical. He says: "I am willing to sell you my labour when, although the wages are small, it is worth my while to take them, for so long as I want to earn them. If after I have worked three days I stop my work, you stop my wages: we are neither of us the worse: we have made a fair exchange." The notion of binding himself to con-

tinue to sell his work after he has ceased to want the wages appears to him ridiculous, and except under pressure he will not do it. And he resents the pressure. Obviously, however, that kind of labour supply makes systematic farming impossible.

The renting of land to squatters and the employment of labour tenants on an estate have always been found in the long-run undesirable. South African native policy is increasingly set on getting rid of squatter tenure, either by assigning land for purchase by natives or, if the more liberal ideas are followed, by encouraging permanent leasehold tenure. The temporary labour tenant proves equally unsatisfactory. His holding not being his own, he will not build a substantial house: he will not establish permanent cultivation of saleable produce: he exhausts one garden plot and shifts to another. Leaving his wife in her village at home, he takes a new consort on the estate and disseminates bastardy or disease. Either the squatter or labour tenant cannot keep stock, or, if he does so, they invariably become a nuisance to the estate proprietor. He and his household become a nest of thieves. They steal from the estates, and, having themselves no interest in permanent cultivation, they steal from one another and from their neighbours who have.

The Government of Jamaica began its attempts to improve the African peasant agriculture of the island by direct methods: setting up demonstration plots, sending Kew-trained gardeners to lecture, distributing pamphlets. Such measures were as ineffectual as the like have been when attempted by the Board of Agriculture in this country for the improvement of British farming. The contempt of the negro planter for all this kind of "buckra foolishness" was hardly less complete than is (or at any rate used to be) that of the Farmers' Union for "Whitehall agriculture." It is a mistake to suppose that British-trained agriculturists can see at a glance what is wrong and what is right with African methods, the product of long traditional experience. Instructors had to be found who did not appear as officers of the State or agents of the employing class, but were men who understood and sympathised with the lives of the people and loved to work with them. They proceeded experi-

mentally, not on Government demonstration plots, which to the negroes meant nothing, but by inducing them on their own grounds to try methods of improving things good and useful for themselves. They improved tillage by substituting the digging fork for the hoe, and showing how to use it.

I feel no doubt whatever that similar methods can be applied to native African agriculture with much of the same results as have been obtained in Jamaica. It is a slow process, but it progresses and does not go back. It is thirty years since it was taken in hand in Jamaica, and it might appear to a visitor who did not know what the conditions had been before that nothing very magnificent has been done. But the work done is truly substantial, and the younger generation will profit by it more rapidly.

One great help in Jamaica has been that the banana, like coffee, became a money crop common to both estates and small-holders. Bananas were long solely a negro's crop. The estates ignored it. Its arable cultivation, which is now of enormous value, was first methodically taken up by an American schooner captain and later by a Scotch Government Medical Officer on abandoned sugar estates. Its tillage, drainage, manuring, pruning, etc., were developed by such innovators, and the improved methods have reacted on the peasants' cultivation. In connection with such crops of his own the negro cultivator is ready to profit by the methods of Europeans, and those of his class who go out to work on estates know their work when they come to it and practise it as an art, as they will not practise agricultural tasks which they have mechanically discharged as operations for their employer's profit. A growing population of negro peasant-proprietors continually produces young men who want work as estate labourers. The more the agriculture which is indispensable to the mass of the people and which cannot be superseded by large estate work is improved and developed, the better becomes the service available, at fair rates of wages, from the labourers who seek work, and the better their understanding of the needs of estate employers and of the fairness of their demand for continuous and reliable service.

As to Africa, Sir Hugh Clifford's testimony coin-

cides absolutely with the effect of the foregoing review. He says:

> "The sanest basis for great economic development in a tropical country is peasant proprietorship. . . . The day when they (the Governments in charge of African affairs) forget that the land is the African's, and attempt to convert it into freehold for the European, they will lay the axe at the root of all that is best in, and all that makes for the solidity of, our rule of the West African Colonies." (Sir Hugh Clifford, formerly Governor of Nigeria.—*Times*, 18th June 1925.)

[NOTE.—Much of the foregoing chapter appeared in the form of an article in the *Edinburgh Review* for January 1929, and I am obliged to the Publishers, Messrs Longmans, Green & Co., for permission to reprint that matter here. O.]

CHAPTER XXVII

THE EUROPEAN WORKERS' CHARTER FOR COLOURED LABOUR

In dealing with the relations of White Capital and Coloured Labour the Labour and Socialist International Congress of Brussels, in August 1928,[1] formulated its criticism of those relations to the following effect. The statement is moderate in its language and in its substance incontestable. In transcribing it almost textually I shall merely interpolate certain expansions, illustrations, and explanations.

> "Colonial policy has been one of the means of the extension of the capitalist system throughout the world.
>
> "It has opened up the natural resources of backward countries and has applied in those countries efficient methods of production and means of transport developed in modern times in European societies, thus enormously increasing the supply of the raw materials required by the world economic organisation in promoting the international division and co-operation of the productive force of labour.
>
> "But this great development of productive forces and extension of procedures of civilisation, advantageous on the whole to the civilised world, has been purchased at the cost of many evils; native races have been subjected to overbearing foreign domination and to shameless exploitation and robbery by European capitalists and their agents, or by white immigrants from neighbouring African territories who with the support of their national Governments have deprived natives of the possession of their land and employed various methods of compulsion to force or induce them to work for them.

[1] See *The Colonial Problem.* Labour and Socialist International Congress, 1928. Labour Party, Transport House, S.W. 1. Price 1s. 6d.

The profits derived from the exploitation of the natural resources of these territories and of the natives' labour have been largely exported to the colonising Power, to the detriment of the development of native resources for the benefit of the natives themselves, with discouragement of the application of native industry to its own purposes, and also to the great social detriment of the essential institutions of native life.

"On the other hand, the development of production and of modern transport in such territories has forced the social and cultural education of native peoples on modern lines and has made them accessible to and appreciative of the significance of European democratic ideas.

"In the exercise of their policy of exploiting local economic resources in Imperial and European interests European Governments have in various places used some or all of the following means :—

"(*a*) They have declared their own Governments the owners of all or much of these territories, ignoring, superseding, or suspending the rights of the natives, in whatever form, whether of communal or individual ownership, these rights may have been established among the natives themselves as part of their recognised system of law."

It is true that so far as such declarations of legal right have been made by the British Government they have often at the same time been argued as morally justifiable in order to protect natives against the folly and ignorance of their chiefs in making concessions of land or other monopoly rights to uncontrolled foreign adventurers. But the practical application of the doctrine that the land did not belong to the natives, but to the Imperial Power, has been and is that especially in parts of South Africa, Southern Rhodesia, Kenya, the resident natives either have been dispossessed of and evicted from their homes or have only been allowed to remain there on the payment of rent either to the Government or to European grantees of the Government for this permission, or on condition of their working as servants of the European proprietor.

"(*b*) European Governments have sanctioned and enforced agreements purporting to convey vast areas of land or concessions of exclusive mineral rights made by native chiefs at absurd prices to European adventurers.

"(*c*) They have imposed upon the natives direct taxes with a view to compelling them to work for Europeans and have exacted compulsory labour for porterage and for public works.

"(*d*) With the same object, namely, that of ensuring a regular and docile labour supply, they have imposed laws for the registration of natives and forbidden them to move freely about their own country.

"(*e*) They have imposed by law discrimination against natives as such; forbidding the employment of natives in skilled industries operated by machinery.

"(*f*) Having established Masters' and Servants' Laws requiring the employment of natives under contract for prescribed periods, they have rendered it a criminal offence, punishable by fine or imprisonment, for natives to absent themselves from work without leave, thus depriving them of the right to strike work for better conditions: and they have prohibited by law meetings of natives or the discussion of opinions regarded by Europeans as likely to create disaffection of the natives against their employers."

Every one of these oppressive forms of public policy enacted and enforced by the local Governments, some of them controlled by the Colonial Office, some of them not, are exemplified to-day within the boundaries of the British Empire. These facts are, I think, not generally apprehended and recognised, and to anyone who entertains a self-satisfied pride in what he is accustomed to regard as the free principles of the British Empire they may appear singular and remarkable. They are almost entirely characteristic of the last forty years of that Imperial expansion of which I have spoken as the period of Capitalist Imperialism, and they are, as I have pointed out in some detail, absent in our older possessions in which colonies were founded, originally on similar principles, but which were purged of

these servile characteristics as part of the abolition of slavery, whether such communities were white men's countries, such as the West Indies, or whether they are territories not classed as white men's countries, such as West Africa and Nigeria.

The partition of Africa, which laid the foundation of the modern developments I have specially criticised, was agreed to by the European Powers concerned on the basis, assumption, or pretext of an ostensible consent by the natives to accept the sovereignty or protection of the European Power to which each particular sphere of influence had been assigned. The transaction to which this assent was expressed was in almost all cases a treaty or an agreement between some agent of the Imperial Power and the chiefs of the native people concerned. The chief did not, except in a very few instances, give his land to the King or Queen of England, he merely accepted the sovereignty or protection of the British Crown and received in exchange a flag and sometimes a present or a yearly allowance of money. In the case of actual concessions of minerals to private adventurers, recommended by the British Government, he frequently received more substantial consideration. But in almost all cases the native tribes were encouraged to accept British sovereignty by the reputation, advertised and preached by missionaries, of the British Crown as a guarantor of freedom and equal justice. Native chiefs and their peoples have frequently been extremely surprised to learn what was certainly not at the time made clear to them, possibly because our Judicial Committee had not then discovered it, that by accepting the King's protection they had made him the proprietor of all the land of their territories. And in many other respects, through the application of the policies of which a summary has been given above, they have had reason to complain that the British Government has not kept the promises which were made in the King's name.

The Labour and Socialist International Congress formulated demands on behalf of the natives which to them at any rate would probably appear to be reasonable and just, and which are no more than would have assuredly been stipulated by their chiefs at the time that the treaties

were made had the necessity for so doing occurred to and been understood by them, as a precaution against white men's ideas of justice.

These demands are thus formulated:

"1. That in all those territories of tropical and sub-tropical Africa and the Pacific, all land not already appropriated by Europeans shall be recognised as the property of the native community.

"2. That every native family should be assured sufficient land for its support.

"3. That no taxes or any burdens whatsoever shall be imposed upon the natives except for the administration of public services which directly benefit the natives.

"4. That no taxes should be permitted that a native cannot pay without leaving home to work for an employer.

"5. That every form of enforced or indentured labour and every kind of taxation or pressure practised for the purpose of forcing natives into employment shall be abolished.

"6. That no labour contracts should be enforceable under the sanctions of penal law; all labour contracts should be made before a magistrate or other official of administration; the labour contract should be a civil contract, breaches of which should be remedied by civil process only.

"7. That the recruiting and conditions of labour should be so regulated and inspected as to prevent industrial slavery and the economic dislocation of the life of the village and tribal communities.

"8. The Congress entirely condemns the principle of racial discrimination in industry."

The Congress further resolved:

"That foreign capitalists and planters exploiting the natural resources should be obliged to contribute a sufficient portion of their profits for the purposes of native welfare and education.

"That native agriculture and the growth of agricultural produce should be assisted and encouraged

by Government. Where machinery for joint production, scientific assistance, etc., are required, the Government should supply the necessary capital through Agricultural Loan Banks or otherwise, encourage the use of improved processes, and promote co-operation for marketing. Governments should assist and encourage the establishment of consumers' co-operation among the natives.

"So long as the native populations of these territories are not qualified effectually to control by democratic Parliamentary institutions the intricate mechanism of a civilised state, it is essential that the European exploiting class should not be placed in unrestricted control of the local Government. The judiciary and public administration should be independent of them. The judicial institutions and the administration of justice should insure that the natives would have equal protection before the law with the dominating races.

"Wherever electoral institutions exist, the franchise should be general and equal and the electoral roll a common one with mixed electorates, to the entire exclusion of privileged enfranchises.

"Means for promoting the hygienic welfare of the natives should be organised on a large scale."

"General Principles

"In all colonies the military employment of natives for other purposes than the defence of the particular territory concerned should be forbidden, so long as these territories do not enjoy full self-government.

" As regards the new system of mandates, the Congress declares: That the principle of trusteeship under the League of Nations cannot be restricted arbitrarily to particular territories: it must be extended to cover all tropical and sub-tropical Africa and similar colonies of primitive culture elsewhere. The right of the community of nations to supervise the due execution by the trustee of the obligation of the trust must be recognised. Meanwhile, the authority of the Per-

manent Mandates Commission of the League of Nations should be strengthened, and it should hear evidence in support of petitions addressed to it by aggrieved groups in the territories in question.

"The International Labour Office should elaborate a code for the protection of native workers which should be adopted by all States administering colonies as a minimum code of protection. The Mandates Commission of the League of Nations should accept the duty of watching the enforcement of this code in all mandated territories.

"In respect of all unmandated territories the Governments concerned should accept the same code as a minimum and entrust the same responsibility for watching over its enforcement to the Mandates Commission of the League of Nations.

"The Congress demands the adoption of the open-door policy in all colonies, absolute equality for the trade and industry of all nations, and, where settlement is possible without injury to the welfare of the native inhabitants, similar equality in the rights to settle."

CHAPTER XXVIII

LONG VIEWS AND SHORT VIEWS ON WHITE AND BLACK

THE practical politician—every man, that is, who has to decide for immediate action—must needs take short views of life. With him it is—eat or be eaten—do or die. Every white man in contact with Africans, as a colonist seeking the use of their labour, far more so as a settler establishing his footing among hostile or suspicious aliens, is under this necessity—a situation the atmosphere of which is very different from that in which the critical sociologist and the philosophic historian frame their judgments. For mere survival a certain amount of positive selfishness, of greed, of injustice, even of violence, may sometimes be inevitable, even for dwellers in civilised States. The institutions of civilisation disguise the self-seeking and violence by organising social injustices under constitutional and legalised forms and corporate class interests—a process which frees the individual from the appearance and consciousness of personal responsibility, whilst greatly enhancing the emoluments of his organised selfishness. His personal interest, transfigured to him as that of his profession, his class or his country, presents itself in the gratifying aspect of loyalty and mutual help; his class interest as an essential of social order, his national conquests as God's purpose for the governance of the world. Such altruistic projections of self-interest are essential to self-respect, and may be, in a measure, steps in the evolution of a truly social existence based on consciousness of human fellowship and equality without personal or class conflict.

In industrial relations in the modern civilised world this altruistic utilitarian projection of immediate personal interest takes form most conspicuously in the class opposition of capital and labour: in communities of mixed

colours it takes form in race opposition and colour prejudice. It happens that in tropical countries, where white men cannot endure bodily labour, necessity and predisposition combine to establish among them the social convention that the labouring class in the mixed community shall be of the coloured race, and the corresponding, but not necessarily correlative, demand that the employers shall be the white. So far as the division in industrial relations does really come to correspond with the racial division, the class prejudices and class illusions that arise between the capitalist and proletarian sections of civilised nations energetically reinforce the race prejudices and race illusions that dominate all barbarians, white or coloured, and so quickly establish themselves in any community, however racially mongrel, that develops any sort of corporate consciousness—as, for instance, in the latterly prevalent anthropological figment of the "Anglo-Saxon Race."

The critical observer of mixed communities can observe both these factors of class prejudice at work, and reacting for mutual reinforcement, as to-day in South Africa; but whilst he may quite accurately impute a good deal of the avowed social theory of such communities to the influence of those altruistic projections of personal interest I have referred to, it is quite likely that, if he has no personal experience of the local conditions, he may overrate the influence of the prejudice and underrate that of the immediate personal necessities of the settler endeavouring to establish and maintain his own existence in alien surroundings, in circumstances in which he has to take short views and to act under the stress of the moment for the sake of his own survival and without any pretence of humanitarian principle.

Let me endeavour to state, very briefly, some of the circumstances that impose the short view.

These may, perhaps, be most concisely and generally indicated by pointing out that the uncolonised African is a "savage"—what South Africans, for instance, know as a "Red Kaffir." There is not necessarily any racial significance in the condition of savagery or paganism: its opposition is to civilisation or Christianity. The Nordic hordes that invaded Britain were savages: their social codes and customs

were, like their economy of subsistence, exceedingly similar to those characteristic, up to quite recent times, of African peoples. They were based on the possession of cattle, the tilling of individual allotments of communal land, the maintenance of the war-host of all able-bodied free men for plunder and self-defence, the slavery of captives and the conquered, and the domestic control of women. In such a savage community all secular offences are private and personal matters. Religious or ceremonial offences—all departments of the practice of witchcraft—are essentially public matters. Presumably the survival and persistence of this ancestral instinct is the reason why the "smelling out" and burning of witches maintained itself in England until so recently, and why heresy-hunting has survived nineteen centuries of Christian teaching. But the really important point for the white immigrant colonist is the personal assessment of the secular offence, what he sees as the immorality of the savage. Killing, theft, and deceit, unless they are done in a matter infringing some ceremonial taboo, are not subjects of moral judgment except on the profit of their outcome: there is no restraint of conscience or compunction against them as such. The savage has no conscience except in regard to offences against his own spiritual world, as to which he is very timid. The white man is something entirely external to that world: presumably repugnant to it: at best indifferent. Killing is mere homicide, and its right or wrong depends as entirely and as exclusively on the value of the life taken as it does in all the feuds of the story of "Burnt Njal." To take your enemy's life is of value to you and your tribe, and accordingly meritorious. The conception of sin in such actions, or in adultery, fornication, or slave-owning, is as absent as it was in our Nordics until they impinged on ecclesiastical Christianity. White men, therefore, living in contact with African savage peoples, are living amongst men whose tribal duty it is to be able and ready to kill, steal, and deceive, and who have not the slightest moral conscientiousness to restrain them from doing so if they see their interest or their satisfaction in it.

A savage, no doubt, will not kill without some positive reason, but the reason that may induce him to do so may

seem to the civilised man as horribly trivial as do the reasons for most of the killings in the Icelandic Njal Saga. His positive reasons may be of various kinds—private vengeance for injury, or the desire for sacrificial "medicine," or social conspiracy to destroy the invading white man or exterminate him when he has settled. But whatever the efficient positive motive, there is in the authentic savage no restraint from anything of the nature of "conscience" or moral compunction; the only checks are personal fear of the wrath of ghostly powers, of retaliation or of failure, or considerations of other personal disadvantage likely to result from the deed.

Moreover, the African, characteristically, decides and acts largely under the crowd-impulse: the forces of the collective social sub-consciousness are powerful in all his affairs. The decisions of his tribal conclaves are habitually unanimous: the undivided judgment of the minority is not simply overridden by a majority vote—it is transmuted and disappears. As I have mentioned, all the labourers on a West Indian estate will strike work with a sympathetic unanimity unknown to the best-organised British trade union; and the best labour of Africans—digging, planting, tree-felling, railway-making, house-building—is done in gangs with abundant chatter and singing. When violence and arson, riot and homicide are on hand, this irrational contagiousness becomes the greatest danger of mixed communities, as every one knows who has had to do with collections of Africans under the incentive of such excitement, whether in Africa or even, after generations of transplantation and civilisation, in the West Indies.

This knowledge—the latent fear of this uncontrolled possibility in the African native—is contributory to an attitude of white towards coloured in mixed communities which is apt itself to appear barbarous. It is barbarous in the strict sense of the word, being the reflex in the white man of the black man's temper in this connection. For so long as the white man's life and settlement are in danger, or are believed to be so, he will not take the long view prescribed by the Buddhist and Christian religions, he will not give himself to feed the tiger nor abstain from resisting aggression. He will deem it his first business to secure his own survival and to

forestall the coloured man on his own ground, if any question of struggle arises. When the savage kills he makes no complaint that the civilised man should kill back. It may be that the world would advance more quickly if the white man abstained from doing so; but that, to the pioneer of settlement, is an off-chance he may be excused for neglecting, when his life and that of his family and friends are concerned, in comparison with the certainty that if he does not meet the savage in methods that the latter understands, he and his, at any rate in this life, will not share in that advance. And every man not a missionary who goes into contact with coloured races goes primarily with the purpose and intention of living and maintaining himself: the paramount demand of the logic of his situation is that he should not be killed; that he should kill the native rather, if the latter will not allow him peaceful settlement. The white man in contact with barbarism, however humane, may very well find himself compelled to act barbarously: this is one of the many ways in which contact with inferior peoples demoralises the civilised man; and the sense of this demoralising influence, on himself and his children, is often a source of resentment to him and a positive factor in the creation of race prejudice. White women, especially, often detest the black folk amongst whom they live very largely because they feel that association with them demoralises and barbarises their children.

What I have noted as to homicide, namely, that with the tribal African it is still only judged of by the standard of the mediæval Nordic—that is to say, as merely a question of the price to be paid by the slayer and his family or gildsmen—and is not judged by any standard of sinfulness or criminality, applies, of course, equally to the spheres of property and sex-relations. They are not the subject of any prescriptive moral judgment. If no taboo is violated, and if no one that can retaliate is injured, there is no moral offence; and injury to any person of influence can be punished or redressed by the payment of the proper price. Morality in such matters is not yet existent, or is at best quite rudimentary. And the man of short views, in contact and in dealings with races innocent as yet of his accustomed moral standards, is under strong inducement

to shelve his own and to deal with him, the savage, as the savage would deal with and with his own fellow-savages. He has only his own self-respect to restrain him. The respect of the savage for any moderation on his part will be far to seek.

The colonist, living as he does under a different necessity from the civilised home-dweller, inevitably comes to take short views in practical matters in regard to which the latter has leisure and security to assert more far-seeing doctrines. I have spoken above of his code of industrial morality, which is not that of the uncivilised African, nor of his transplanted descendant in the New World. The industrial code of slave morality dominates savage communities. It was because the native uncolonised African, conquered in war, had still before him only the same two alternatives as had the ancient Greek, or the Briton before the Saxon—that is, death or thraldom; it is because his women do not own themselves and are in perpetual tutelage, that he accepted slavery, as he did in the Congo State and the Island of San Thomé, resignedly and fatalistically, as he had accepted it in the days when Liverpool and Bristol grew great on the profits of the export slave-trade. He has therefore been submissive and even patient, being confronted, as he conceives, with necessity. Here, again, is temptation to the conquering white man to encroach on his liberties—to deal with him as he would not deal with a civilised white worker. I have noticed that other reaction of the slave morality, that makes it the test of a free man not to work under pledge or contract for any employer, and the test of a wise and astute man to do as little work under compulsion or for pay as he can manage to get through with. The colonist, being under his own (even if self-sought) necessity, requiring labour from the black man to maintain himself, as the capitalist and endowed class at home require it from the wage-worker, and finding he cannot obtain it in Africa on the same terms, is here again under temptation to take short views, to accommodate his practice to his environment, to preach coercion and discipline as absolutely necessary, and to see, as the natives see, no moral harm in them, only bare-faced oppression of the weak by the powerful.[1]

[1] I have quoted typical expressions of this point of view by contemporary European barbarians in Africa. See Chapter XXV.

It is not surprising that Europeans, settled among Africans, confronted every day with habits and mental attitudes so different from their own, so adverse to their interests, to their modes of livelihood, so constantly provocative to what they (perhaps) feel to be their own baser tendencies, should, in defence of their own ideals, if not in self-excuse or self-protection, conceive and assert the theory of an insurmountable race barrier. And yet it is indisputable that where the African has ceased to be unmoral, has learnt through Christianity or Islam a generalised conception of obligation, another standard of right and wrong than that of mere personal advantage or grievance, where he has acquired full and equal citizenship, where industrial difficulties have solved themselves by the practical emancipation of the black labourer, race prejudice has become the mere shadow of its former self. I have already quoted Professor Royce, of Harvard, in support of my statements on this point in reference to the British West Indies. I wish to reinforce the conclusions I have set forth from my own observations on the subject of race prejudice in its widest aspect by quoting further from the same notable essay:

> "Scientifically viewed, these problems of ours turn out not to be so much problems caused by anything which is essential to the existence or to the nature of the races of men themselves. Our so-called race problems are merely the problems caused by our antipathies.
>
> "Now the mental antipathies of men, like the fears of men, are very elemental, widespread, and momentous mental phenomena. But they are also in their fundamental nature extremely capricious, and also extremely suggestible mental phenomena. Let an individual man alone and he will feel antipathies for certain other human beings very much as any young child does, namely, quite capriciously, just as he will feel all sorts of capricious likings for people. But train a man first to give names to his antipathies, and then to regard the antipathies thus named as sacred merely because they have a name, and then you get the phenomena of racial hatred, of religious hatred, of class

hatred, and so on indefinitely. Such trained hatreds are peculiarly pathetic and peculiarly deceitful, because they combine in such a subtle way the elemental vehemence of the hatred that a child may feel for a stranger, or a cat for a dog, with the appearance of dignity and solemnity and even of duty which a name gives. Such antipathies will always play their part in human history. But what we can do about them is to try not to be fooled by them, not to take them too seriously because of their mere name. We can remember that they are childish phenomena in our lives, phenomena on a level with a dread of snakes, or of mice, phenomena that we share with the cats, and with the dogs, not noble phenomena, but caprices of our complex nature.

"All such elemental social experiences are highly suggestible. Our social training largely consists in the elimination or in the intensification or in the systematising of these original reactions through the influence of suggestion and of habit. Hence the antipathy, once by chance aroused, but then named, imitated, insisted upon, becomes to its victims a sort of sacred revelation of truth, sacred merely because it is felt, a revelation merely because it has won a name and a social standing.

"What such sacred revelations, however, really mean is proved by the fact that the hungry traveller, if deprived of his breakfast long enough, by means of an accidental delay of his train, or the tired camper in the forest, may readily come to feel whatever racial antipathy you please against his own brother, if the latter then wounds social susceptibilities which the abnormal situation has made momentarily hyperæsthetic.

"For my part, I am a member of the human race, and this is a race which is, as a whole, considerably lower than the angels, so that the whole of it very badly needs race elevation. In this need of my race I personally and very deeply share. And it is in this spirit only that I am able to approach our problem."

The long view—the view justified by history and experience, with regard to mixed communities and racial

distinctions—is that no finality can be asserted with regard to them; only that the special characteristics of the moral and social principles which we now find prevailing in barbarous peoples, of alien breed to ourselves, have invariably been characteristics of peoples of all races in the corresponding stage of social evolution, and are, therefore, not racial. They will yield to the same, or similar influences, as have eliminated them from our own societies. But as they have taken centuries to transmute among so-called "white" races, it is not to be supposed that they will vanish in a generation, or by the mere operation of "conversion," in the African of to-day.

Nor, I think, is it likely that some of them will vanish at all. I have not in these chapters attempted a complete discussion of the problem of mixed communities. I have only entered into these questions where they have obvious connection with the difficulties that arise out of interracial relations in the industrial sphere, and it is because these relations tend continually to reduce themselves to those of master and servant, employer and employee, that my treatment of the subject as one of "White Capital and Coloured Labour" has been even so discursive in regard to race relations as it has been. My argument with regard to them has been that race prejudice and the belief in insuperable race distinctions are fetishes of the man of short views; and parts of a short-sighted and suicidal creed, auguring no healthy future for the community that entertains it. At the same time an instinctive, intelligible, and, to some degree, an excusable and justifiable mental attitude. That the long view demands the contrary attitude, to recognise that race limitations not only do not hold good permanently against educational influences, but cannot be relied on as a foundation for any sound political architecture; that the human will is more than the racial will, and will not, in any mixed community, rest satisfied within its racial embodiment. The more backward race, the class adjudged servile, will constantly be infringing the monopolies of the leading race, asserting and displaying equality with the white man in spheres which he has conceived to be naturally his own exclusive province. The assignment of the status of labourer to the coloured man is of no avail

when he can refuse to give his labour, and it seems to me that in the sphere of industry one great prerogative of European civilisation is likely to remain its own exclusive privilege. The impression I have derived from my survey is that the methods of the capitalist *grande Industrie*, the perfect organisation of capital and wage proletariat, that has developed itself in civilised countries through land monopoly and industrial anarchy, do not and are not likely to commend themselves to African races, that they cannot be imposed upon them except through a policy of exclusion from land and of forced labour; and that any attempt to force those races into them not only does not benefit them, but is certain to prove disastrous to both black and white.

If the white colonist cannot compel the coloured to work for him, and cannot live in tropical lands unless he can induce his co-operation, his continued supremacy in those countries must rest—as, in fact, it does now rest—on a spiritual superiority. The white man can lead and govern the savage because and in so far as he is not himself a savage. The principles by virtue of which the white European has obtained a leadership which even Islam cannot contest with him are principles which deny race distinctions. There lies his strength. If he goes back from them he becomes himself a barbarian, and though he may exterminate the black he cannot lead or live with him.

I have known West Indian negroes thank God for slavery, as having been a means to their people of advance towards freedoms unknown to the African savage. But I have never known them thank the white man for slavery. It is not the slave-owning side or the slave-driving section of the civilised white that has freed them; they know that the elements in white civilisation and character through whose assistance they have attained their social and spiritual freedom are not the same as those that brought them into slavery. Of the side of human character that enslaves, and of the motives for enslavement, the African knows far too much for him ever to give the white man credit for educational purpose in any aggression he may make on his liberties. Genuinely philanthropic and honest advocates there may be of the "Educational Labour Policy," but

the African will always regard it with black suspicion. Suspicion, bred of the fear of enslavement and oppression ingrained by generations of savagery, and a cunning that dissembles his true desires and aims, are characteristics deeply impressed on and obstinately persistent in him. The West Indian negro peasant still is full of them. He maintains under forms of submission and compliance his independent personal and racial will and judgment. He will not finally accept what the white man, in his own personal interest, gives him, but what he himself chooses, and can realise. No mixed community can attain unity and health if the white man assumes an attitude which stimulates and maintains this alienating suspicion in the black, or where a governing class bases its polity on the short-sighted theory that the dividing habits of race are permanently stronger than the unifying power of Humanity.

CHAPTER XXIX

A FOURTH PERIOD OF COLONIAL POLICY

WHATEVER insufficiencies or ambiguities there may be in the doctrine of trusteeship promulgated in the Covenant of the League of Nations, and so uncompromisingly adopted on behalf of the British Government in the Kenya White Paper of 1923, that pronouncement in the Covenant and its ostensible adoption by European nations were very important events. The attitude expressed in them is a distinct and acceptable departure from that of regarding Imperial Dominions as undeveloped estates of the sovereign nation. Those who inspired the formulation of the idea of trusteeship unquestionably were sincere and single-minded in their intention, however lax, sophisticated, and self-interested may be the interpretations which particular mandatories may assign to it. The resolutions adopted by the Brussels International Labour and Socialist Congress of 1928 may be read as an interpretation of the idea of trusteeship applied from the point of view of the native, regarded as a wage-worker among the world's white wage-workers. That document appreciates the value of the institution of the League of Nations and its machinery of the Mandates Commission and the International Labour Office; and in accordance with the spirit which inspires their most sincere manifestations, it uncompromisingly aims at the substitution of international democratic trusteeship for Capitalist Imperialism in the sphere of colonial policy. In this aim it will increasingly associate itself with native peoples still regarded by the Commercial Imperialists primarily and principally in the guise of a labour supply. The general lines of a Fourth Period of Colonial Policy may be recognised as being thus already laid down. Just as the League of Nations embodies the recognition that Imperialist war

can only be restrained and superseded through such a central authority, so the Fourth Period Policy recognises that the exploiting activities of Imperial capitalisms can only be restrained through the agency of similar organisation, based on the internationally associated determination of white and coloured workers alike.

In this connection the Report of the Commission on Closer Union of the British dependencies in Eastern and Central Africa, which was appointed by Mr Amery in pursuance of the announcement made in his White Paper of July 1927, is of great interest and importance. In Chapter XXV I have pointed out the unfortunate ambiguity in which that State Paper left the interpretation of the idea of trusteeship for Africans and the extent of Imperial responsibility in regard to it. The great value of the Report of this Commission, which has appeared while these chapters are in the Press, lies in the recognition of this ambiguity and in its resolute and soundly-inspired endeavour to correct it. I quote the following extracts:—

> "The chief need in East and Central Africa to-day is that there should be applied throughout the territories as a whole, continuously and without vacillation, a native policy which . . . is consistent in its main principles. . . . Whatever constitutional changes are introduced in any local legislatures they must not be such as to jeopardise the maintenance of accepted principles on the vital matter of native policy. If the immigrant communities are to be associated, as suggested in our terms of reference, in the trusteeship for natives, this must not give them power to vary the terms of the trust. . . . The essential principle is that native interests must be regarded as an end in themselves, *i.e.* that the natives cannot be treated as a mere accessory to the immigrant community. . . . The only alternative to a policy of treating the advancement of the natives as an end in itself would be a policy of consistent and perpetual repression."

In Chapters XII to XIV the truth of this proposition has been demonstrated in regard to the South African Union, and a few days before I write this it has been

announced that General Hertzog has made the choice of basing his next Election campaign on the advocacy of Repressionism. Encouraged, no doubt, by the success of the British Conservatives' Election cry of 1924 of "The Red Letter," General Hertzog insists that General Smuts, in making some observations deprecating reaction at Ermelo, has uttered what is already being referred to as "The Black Speech," and as having promised to hand over the Government of the Union to the "red" Kaffirs (a term which does not apply to the political opinions of these black men, but only to their ceremonial pigment).

To return to the Commissioners' Report, they say further, and truly:

> "The strongest foundation of Western civilisation and of British rule does not lie in the size of the white community, which must always remain a relatively small island in the midst of a greatly preponderant black population, but in the establishment of a rule of justice which will enlist the loyalty of the native people, and strengthen their confidence in British rule. . . . It appears to us that nothing is more important than that *there should be a clear idea now*, and at each stage of development, what British policy, both as regards natives and immigrants, is to be, *and that this policy should be affirmed not merely as that of one political party but with the concurrence of all.*
>
> "According to our view, the 'paramountcy of native interests' is to be interpreted in the sense that the creation and preservation of a field for the full development of native life is a first charge on any territory, and that the Government, having created this field, has the duty *to devote all available resources to assisting the natives to develop within it.*
>
> "The foundation on which the protection of native interests as regards labour must be based . . . is *a policy which would make available for every native for his own cultivation sufficient land to maintain himself and his family, and to provide him with the cash required for the taxes which he has to pay.*"

This, it is hardly necessary to point out, is the direct

contrary of the theory which I have mentioned as having formerly prevailed in Jamaica and as still prevailing in Kenya, that if natives are placed in such a position the problem of labour supply for estates will never be settled and European civilisation cannot even be maintained or established. On the other hand, it coincides with the pronouncement in this connection of the Brussels Labour and Socialist International Congress.

The emphasis laid by the Commission upon the necessity of reformulating our Imperial native policy, if it is sympathetically followed up, cannot fail to promote the formulation of such a Deed of Trusteeship in consonance, and it may be hoped in co-operation, with the Mandates Commission of the League of Nations and the International Labour Office, both of which are much concerned with the questions involved. If this course is pursued we should approach a realisation of the idea of the framers of section 22 of the Covenant in the establishment of a code which should definitely assimilate the policies of all nations controlling backward peoples in Africa and bring the interpretation and application of that code increasingly under the cognisance and criticism of the League of Nations Assembly, in accordance with the purpose declared by the Brussels International Congress in the document quoted in Chapter XXVII.

NOTE ON CHAPTER II, p. 39.

NOTE A.—The suggestion that the brains of the higher species appear to have developed in anticipation of the possible exercise by the mass of the species of the faculties thus provided for is one for which I am indebted to utterances of Professor G. Elliott Smith. It is very pertinent to the problem of variation, and contributes to dissociate explanations of it from the theory of chance, sifted by natural selection. Since this chapter was in type I find the suggestion reinforced by a lecture of Professor Sir Arthur Keith, at the Royal College of Surgeons on the 26th January 1929, from the *Times* Report, of which I make the following extract:—

> "Had man come by a bigger brain than he really needed? How had he come by it? It could hardly be as a result of use, for it was well known that human beings rarely used their abilities up to fifty per cent. of their capacity. One could not conceive that mere use, through an infinity of generations, could convert an ape's brain into that of man. . . . He knew of only one line of reasoning which threw light on this curious problem—the over-capitalisation of the human brain. Engineers in building bridges or cranes always planned them to withstand a strain which was ten times that which was likely to fall on them. In planning they always applied a 'factor of safety.' Only athletes, and even in their case only for the briefest of spells, used their hearts and lungs to near the limit of safety: most of the time they ran them on a 10 to 15 per cent. of their power. Only once or twice in a lifetime did a man exert all the power there was in his muscles; the power lay latent awaiting an emergency which perhaps came only once in fifty generations. Now the same principle applied to man's brain: it had, in healthy people, an enormous factor of safety. It was this factor which had made it possible for beings designed originally for a jungle life to have abilities of a transcendent power."

This, to a life-long Lamarckian evolutionist, is very encouraging.

SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

The book *Capital and Labour*, published in 1906, has demanded revision and enlargement in view of developments in modern relations between Europeans and Africans. The title is now even more appropriate to these relations, because the policy of Imperial development has made them more generally and distinctly those of employers and wage-earners. The extended study of genetics, in the light of Mendelism, has also added material to the critique of racial phenomena.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY

Intention of the book. The doctrine of the White Man's Burden. Industrial Confrontation of White and Black as Employer and Employee. Industrial relation complicated by distinction of Race. Imperialist sentiment philanthropic, but Imperial Expansion not undertaken from motives of philanthropy. Endeavour to clear the subject of illusion. The efficient motive of colonisation economic, not humanitarian.

CHAPTER II

RACE

Causes of racial distinctions. These distinctions a limitation of Humanity and do not override individuality. Completeness and limitation of racial consciousness. Racial Godhead. Inter-racial criticism necessarily partial and impertinent. The theory of insuperable race-barriers. Its necessary instability. Inter-breeding. Physiological aspect of hybridisation. Psychological consequences: double and multiple consciousness. Theological consequences: dethronement of the racial God. Invincibility of conquered races. Analogy of racial and sexual differentiation and limitations.

CHAPTER III

THE INDUSTRIAL FACTOR IN RACE PREJUDICE

The danger of unrestricted authority. Its aggravations by racial distinction. The " Providential " insensibility of coloured races. The increase of colour prejudice in America concurrently with the increase of manufacturing industry in the South. Its mitigation when competition was relaxed during the War. The negation of native human rights in the Congo State. Change in European theory with regard to the humanity of the African races as European contact has changed from missionary and trading connection to industrial and exploiting connection.

CHAPTER IV

THE THREE PERIODS OF COLONIAL POLICY

Liability to confusion in treatment of subject owing to successive changes in relations, character of economic contact and Imperial policy in different periods. Three principal types of European economic relations with coloured peoples: (1) Trading—especially slave-trading, (2) Colonisation, (3) Exploitation through " development " of territories. Three periods of colonial policy: (1) White Commercial Capitalism exploiting coloured labour transported as slaves, (2) Colonial Liberalism aiming at justice and humanity in relations with coloured peoples, (3) White Commercial Capitalism exploiting coloured labour in Africa.

CHAPTER V

THE TRANSPLANTED AFRICAN (I)

Race relations in the United States and the British West Indies. Social and industrial conditions in the West Indies. Society in Jamaica. Attenuation of colour prejudice. Aversion to inter-mixture by marriage. Consideration of the results of inter-breeding. Social value and importance of the class of mixed descent.

CHAPTER VI

THE TRANSPLANTED AFRICAN (II)

Colour relations much healthier in the West Indies than in the United States or South Africa. Examination of colour prejudice in the United States. The terror of "Social Equality." American apprehensions contradicted by West Indian experience. The impudence of the Negro. His alleged licentiousness. His provocations in the American attitude.

CHAPTER VII

THE TRANSPLANTED AFRICAN (III)

The political difficulty in America an important source of trouble. Democracy and universal suffrage deferred after emancipation in the West Indies. The self-protective illegalities of the Southern Whites. The dangers of Negrophobia. Its absence in the West Indies. Irrationality and danger of the colour line.

CHAPTER VIII

AMERICAN CORROBORATIONS

Testimony of American writers, Mrs Ella Wheeler Wilcox and Professor Josiah Royce, in corroboration of views set forth in the preceding chapter.

CHAPTER IX

THE UNCOLONISED AFRICAN

Conditions in West Africa. Earlier European contact mainly for purposes of trade. The Natives willing traders. Hardly any settlement of Europeans for productive agriculture or manufacture, except a few mining ventures. British administration devoted to opening up countries to trade, and imposing peace between tribes. The new departures in certain districts, such as the Congo Free State, Capitalist exploitation carried on by forced levies instead of by employment of wage labour. Modern slavery in Portuguese East Africa. Apart from forcible oppression and the compulsion of starvation no human being tolerates the unregulated demands of capitalist employment.

CHAPTER X

INDENTURED IMMIGRANT LABOUR

The general basis of Indentured Immigration; the pressure of hunger. Legal penalties for idleness in the employee unnecessary in civilised countries, but necessary to the employer where starvation does not threaten. Protection of the employee against the employer secured by immigration laws in British colonies as it has had to be secured by Factory Laws in Great Britain.

CHAPTER XI

THE IDLENESS OF THE AFRICAN

The standard of servile virtue, applied in England to the wage-earning class, in the tropics to the Negro. The European worker works hard because he is compelled by fear of starvation. The African does not because he is not under such compulsion. Why he works better in some respects as a slave. Why indentured Indian labour was employed in the West Indies. The intractability of the African to the capitalist industrial system. Informed contradictions of the imputation of idleness to the African. S.A. Native Affairs Commission, 1905, and Mr Dudley Kidd (see Chap. XII). Bishop Weston of Zanzibar. Phelps-Stokes Education Report. Kavirondo Taxpayers' Association, etc.

CHAPTER XII

LATTER-DAY SOUTH AND EAST AFRICAN HISTORY

The partition of Africa. Concession hunting. Intervention of Powers. Establishment of Financial Companies. Policy of Protectorates and Native Reserves. Development of mining industry. Increasing competition between poor Whites and native wage-workers. East African development. Settlers' land and labour policy. Policy of the South African Government—restriction of native landowning. Compulsion on the native, by taxation and prohibition of independent landowning in European areas, to work for Europeans. Over-capitalisation in Kenya stimulated by British policy of Capitalist Imperialism.

CHAPTER XIII

COLOURED LABOUR IN SOUTH AFRICA (I)

The Bantu Race. The South African Native Affairs Commission. Their view of the industrial disposition of the African. The Native labour supply, its deficiency to the demand. Character of this demand, not an organic need of the community, but a demand on the part of foreign capital for labour force to be used for the profit of European investors and employers. Unlimited character of this demand. Effects of the capitalist demand for labour on the attitude of White towards Black. The theory that the Native must be taught and induced to work. The Commission's criticism of a land policy directed to this end.

CHAPTER XIV

COLOURED LABOUR IN SOUTH AFRICA (II)

Extracts from evidence before Select Committee of South African Parliament on General Hertzog's Native Affairs Bills. Evidence of Commissioners for Native Affairs, representative natives, Ministers of religion, and independent Europeans as to oppressive tendencies of State policy. Evidence of farmers' representatives admitting injustice but insisting that repression of natives necessary to maintain European civilisation. View that decision must be by force and if necessary extermination of natives. Recent tendencies towards association of white Trade Unionism with native Trade Unionism in common defence of interests of labour.

CHAPTER XV

NATIVE LABOUR IN PORTUGUESE AFRICA

Report of Professor Ross and Dr Cramer on Forced Labour and ill-treatment of natives in Portuguese colonies. Corroborations in letters from British witnesses.

CHAPTER XVI

THE MISSIONARY PLEA

Two motives bringing white men into contact with black, the missionary and the economic. Should white enterprise be excluded from black countries? The theory of educative protection. The theory of the White Man's Burden. Its futility, because men will not colonise from missionary motives. The disillusionment of the savage with regard to Christianity when he comes into direct contact with the business European.

CHAPTER XVII

EDUCATIONAL PROBLEMS

Inter-breeding unimportant in the principal native areas of contact between white and black. Propensity of employing class to disparage educational capacity of the employee class. Qualities of the African's intelligence. Its practical sensibility. Programme of manual instruction. The danger of evangelical missions. The spiritual temperament of the African. His introversion. Impossibility of dealing with him by force alone, or as a child. White men do not approach him as such. His attitude in practical politics.

CHAPTER XVIII

INFLUENCES OF THE WHITE ON THE BLACK

The white man a force whose leadership and significance the black cannot ignore. How far the African will imitate and learn. The white man will reap what he sows, not moral results from commercial seekings. The importance of the personal attitude.

CHAPTER XIX

KENYA

The locally recognised issue as to Native Labour policy. Labour essential to "development": but can the Native be made to work if he does not want to? What are "our resources" in Africa? The taxation of the Native and what he gets for it. The doctrine of civilisation by contact. The issue in Kenya critical in regard to the future of Africa as between a policy of compulsion and repression, and one in accordance with the traditions of the Second Colonial Period. The reputation of British Power as a protector of African liberties now in danger of being undermined.

CHAPTER XX

THE KENYA FORCED LABOUR CONTROVERSY

The government's Labour circulars. The Resident Natives' Ordinance, establishing forced labour in the reserves, and the Natives' Registration Ordinance intended to "ameliorate the position" of Europeans. The Bishops' Memorandum favouring "some form of compulsion." Lord Milner's discreet reticence. Bishop Weston's protest. Astonishment of the supporters of Missions at the Gilbertian attitude of the Bishop of Rumtifoo. The Duke of Devonshire's pronouncement on Paramountcy of Native Interests. The justification of forced labour for Natives a fraudulent superstructure on Native custom for local purposes, erected for the advantage of Europeans. The serfs of Great Britain.

CHAPTER XXI

DEVELOPMENT AND CIVILISATION

The Imperative Duty of Developing the productive powers of our possessions. What does this dogma imply? The orthodox Marxism of the European theory of development. Repudiation of this theory and analysis of the essentials of civilisation.

CHAPTER XXII

PASS LAWS AND REGISTRATION

Pass Laws the most detested and demoralising instrument of repressionism and compulsion. Their early history in the Cape Colony and their suppression. Child Apprenticeship. The revival of Pass Laws at instance of Johannesburg Chamber of Mines. Revival of Child Apprenticeship at instance of Rhodesian Farmers. Joint movement of Native Unions and Councils of Europeans and Natives demanding the abolition of Pass Laws.

CHAPTER XXIII

THE IMPOSSIBILITY OF REPRESSIONISM

Doctrine of superior rights of White Men repeatedly asserted, never unchallenged and constantly defeated, and where it exists continually attacked. Reasons: It is contrary to profound human convictions of civilised peoples, and no race or people preserving vitality will put up with it. Now confronted in South Africa by Industrial and Commercial Workers Union, with co-operation of white Trade Union representatives. African workers prohibited by law from striking: but a general strike of South African labourers much more feasible and likely to be effectual than one in a European community.

CHAPTER XXIV

THE NEW DEPARTURE OF 1919

The Covenant of the League of Nations declares the proper position of European Powers in Africa: Trusteeship, not development of Imperial Estates. Disastrous effect of European policy of development acknowledged by Rhodesian Land Commission. The International Labour Office and forced labour. The Mandates' Commission and its unwelcome activities.

CHAPTER XXV

THE DOCTRINE OF TRUSTEESHIP

Idea of Trusteeship now generally accepted: Uncompromisingly adopted and proclaimed by British Government as applicable to its possessions. But duties and implications of British Trusteeship not yet defined. Mr Amery waters the Duke of Devonshire's wine. The proposal to delegate Imperial responsibility and to associate local residents in trusteeship. Ideas of these residents on the subject quoted: Compulsion to labour necessary, no likelihood of British Government adopting this policy. *Ergo*, "No solution except to get control of the country in our own hands." Mr Baldwin's charitable eulogy of Colonial Englishmen. A Colonial Englishman's letter. General Hertzog threatens secession if any Englishman criticises his Native policy. Why it is needful to do so.

CHAPTER XXVI

THE PILGRIMAGE OF A NEGRO PEASANTRY

African and European Agriculture. African agriculture efficient for food production, but wasteful of land. Can Native Africans be made a stable labour supply for European estates. Jamaica settled with intention it should be a White Man's Country, land granted out in large estates to be worked by slaves: No land left for Negroes, but African agriculture carried on for food production on back lands of estates. After Emancipation heavy rents and taxes imposed on Negro cultivators and land withheld from them in order to promote their civilisation through contact by working on estates. Effects produced directly contrary, estates could not get Negro labour and imported Indians. Negroes driven into back woods and deteriorated. Missions, by providing land and education for Negroes, alone improved Negro agriculture and civilisation. Land needs of Negroes produced Jamaica rebellion. Crown forfeiture of abandoned estates. Breaking up and sale to Negro

peasant-proprietors. The Jamaica Agricultural Society. Improvement of Negro food production and production for export. Work and growth of the Jamaica Agricultural Society. Now has 267 branches. Testimony to improvement in Negro agriculture and general social conditions. Improvement of Labour supply to estates. Sir Hugh Clifford's corresponding testimony as to basis of economic development.

CHAPTER XXVII

THE EUROPEAN WORKERS' CHARTER FOR COLOURED LABOUR

(See *The Colonial Problem*, Labour and Socialist International Congress, Brussels, 1928. Labour Party, Transport House, S.W. 1. Price 1s. 6d.)

Analysis of the effects of policy of Capitalistic Imperialism. What European Governments have done in their various Dominions among backward Peoples. Statement of demands of organised European Labour on behalf of these peoples and of general principles. Strengthening of authority of Mandates Commission of League of Nations. Code of protection for Native Workers should be framed by International Labour Office. The same principles and code should be adopted in all unmandated territories. Open door policy in all Colonies, equality for trade and industry of all nations, and where settlement possible without injury to native inhabitants, in rights to settle.

CHAPTER XXVIII

LONG VIEWS AND SHORT ON WHITE AND BLACK

Short views necessary for the practical politician and business man. The exigencies of immediate contact with savages create antagonisms and promote rough and ready methods. Savagery not a racial characteristic but common to all people in certain stages of development. Close parallelism between mediæval Nordic and contemporary savage. African ideas on morals and crime. The long view, justified by its application in the British West Indies, that savage characteristics in the Africans will in time yield to the same influences as have modified them in the European.

CHAPTER XXIX

A FOURTH PERIOD OF COLONIAL POLICY

The acceptance by the civilised world of the idea of trusteeship for Natives with its corollary that Native interests must be paramount, is a definite departure from the principle of the development of Imperial Estates, characteristic of the Third Period of Colonial policy. It demands a revision and restatement of principles and a new departure in harmony with the policy of the Second Colonial Period. The report of Sir E. Hilton Young's Commission on closer union of British Dependencies in Eastern and Central Africa states this position clearly. Imperial responsibility for Trusteeship must remain with the Imperial Government and cannot be shared. Western civilisation in Africa does not depend on the size or power of the White community but on the establishment of a rule of Justice. The principles of the new British policy should now be defined, affirmed, and continuously adhered to. These principles must be framed in co-operation with the Mandates Commission of the League of Nations and the International Labour Office.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY NEILL AND CO., LTD., EDINBURGH.

TRENT UNIVERSITY
0 1164 0006248 9

DATE DUE